arXiv:1606.09638v3 [cs.LO] 26 Apr 2017

Computational Higher Type Theory II: Dependent Cubical Realizability

Carlo Angiuli*
Carnegie Mellon University

Robert Harper†
Carnegie Mellon University

July, 2016

Abstract

This is the second in a series of papers extending Martin-Löf's *meaning explanation* of dependent type theory to account for higher-dimensional types. We build on the cubical realizability framework for simple types developed in Part I, and extend it to a meaning explanation of dependent higher-dimensional type theory. This extension requires generalizing the computational Kan condition given in Part I, and considering the action of type families on paths. We define *identification types*, which classify identifications (paths) in a type, and dependent function and pair types. The main result is a *canonicity theorem*, which states that a closed term of boolean type evaluates to either true or false. This result establishes the first computational interpretation of higher dependent type theory by giving a deterministic operational semantics for its programs, including operations that realize the Kan condition.

1 Dependent Types

In Part I of this series [Angiuli et al., 2016] we introduced *abstract cubical realizability* to provide a "meaning explanation" of higher-dimensional simple type theory in the style of Martin-Löf [1984] and Constable, et al. [1985]. In Part II we extend cubical realizability to higher-dimensional *dependent type theory*, which considers type-indexed families of types such as the *cubical identification type* [Licata and Brunerie, 2014; Cohen et al., 2016] and dependent generalizations of the function and product types. The construction provides the first deterministic computational meaning explanation for higher-dimensional dependent type theory:

Theorem 1 (Canonicity)**.** *If* $\cdot \gg M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\cdot]$ *then either* $M \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$ *or* $M \Downarrow \mathsf{false}$.

The proof of the canonicity theorem is straightforward, once the extended realizability interpretation has been obtained. All of the effort is in formulating the meaning explanation and showing that it has the requisite properties.

The development follows along the lines of Part I, but is extended to account for type-indexed families of types. The main effect of dependency is to induce lines between the instance types of the family. Briefly, if B is a family of types indexed by the type A, then points in A determine instances of B, and lines in A determine lines between those instances. The framework of cubical

*cangiuli@cs.cmu.edu
†rwh@cs.cmu.edu

realizability is defined so as to account for lines (and higher cells) between types, and so dependency itself presents no further complications. However, accounting for the cubical identification type, whose n-cells classify $n+1$-cells in a type, requires a modest generalization of the Kan composition operation to admit additional constraints. Whereas in the simply typed case it suffices to consider lines (in any dimension) constrained by lines, here it is necessary to admit more general forms of composition problem. This is managed by extending the Kan composition operation itself to allow for additional "tube faces", and enriching the notion of dimension context to allow for equational constraints among dimension variables. This extension is sufficient to account for the cubical identification type, and closure under dependent forms of function and product types. We have also clarified the definition of a cubical type system, and what it means for a cubical type system to have certain type formers; this reorganization has no material effect on our development.

The purpose of a meaning explanation is to provide a computational semantics for typehood and membership judgments (more precisely, for exact equality of types and exact equality of members of a type at all finite dimensions). The explanation is based on the acceptability of basic predicative comprehension principles used to define the meanings of types. These principles seem scarcely deniable; principles of the same or greater strength would be required to validate the sensibility of a formal type theory defined by a collection of rules. The meaning explanation provides a concept of *truth* in type theory grounded in computation, following the principles elucidated by Martin-Löf and Constable in the one-dimensional case. From this point of view the role of proof theory is to provide a window on the truth. There are few restrictions on the form of a proof theory other than that it derive only true judgments. For example, a proof theory for computational higher type theory need not admit meta-theoretic properties, such as cut elimination or decidability, that are requisite for formal type theories. However, the rules of formal cubical type theory given by Licata and Brunerie [2014] and Cohen et al. [2016] are valid; we give explicit proofs for some representative cases.

Acknowledgements

This paper is an extension of abstract cubical realizability as introduced by Angiuli et al. [2016], whose primary antecedents are two-dimensional type theory [Licata and Harper, 2012], the uniform Kan cubical model of homotopy type theory [Bezem et al., 2014] and the formal cubical type theories [Cohen et al., 2016; Licata and Brunerie, 2014]. We are greatly indebted to Marc Bezem, Evan Cavallo, Kuen-Bang Hou (Favonia), Simon Huber, Dan Licata, Ed Morehouse, and Todd Wilson for their contributions and advice. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research through MURI grant FA9550-15-1-0053. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the AFOSR.

2 Programming language

The programming language itself has two sorts, dimensions and terms, and binders for both sorts. Terms are an ordinary untyped lambda calculus with constructors; dimensions are either dimension constants (0 or 1) or one of countably many dimension names $(x, y, \dots)$ behaving like nominal constants [Pitts, 2015]. Dimension terms occur at specific positions in some terms; for example, loop_r is a term for any dimension term r. The operational semantics is defined on terms that are closed with respect to term variables but may contain free dimension names.

Dimension names represent generic elements of an abstract interval whose end points are notated 0 and 1. While one may sensibly substitute any dimension term for a dimension name, terms are *not* to be understood solely in terms of their dimensionally-closed instances (namely, their end points). Rather, a term's dependence on dimension names is to be understood generically; geometrically, one might imagine additional unnamed points in the interior of the abstract interval.

The language features two terms that are specific to higher type theory. The first, called *coercion*, has the form $\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A}(M)$, where $x.A$ is a type line, r is the *starting* dimension and r' is the *ending* dimension. Coercion transports a term M from $A\langle r/x\rangle$ to $A\langle r'/x\rangle$ using the type line $x.A$ as a guide. Coercion from r to itself has no effect, up to exact equality. Coercion from 0 to 1 or vice versa is transport, which applies one direction of the equivalence induced by the type line. Coercion from 0 or 1 to a dimension name y creates a y-line in $A\langle y/x\rangle$, and coercion from y to 0 or 1 yields a line between one end point of the input y-line and the transport of the opposite end point. Finally, coercion from one dimension name to another reorients the line from one dimension to another.

The second, called *homogeneous Kan composition*, has the form $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N^{\varepsilon}_i})$, where $r_1, \dots, r_n$ are the *extents*, r is the *starting* dimension, and r' is the *ending* dimension. The term M is called the *cap*, and the terms N^0_i and N^1_i form the *tube in the r_i extent*.[1] This composition is well-typed when the starting side of each N^{ε}_i coincides (up to exact equality) with the $r_i = \varepsilon$ side of the cap. When all the r_i are dimension names x_i, the composition results in an $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$-cube, called the *composite*, whose $-\langle \varepsilon/x_i\rangle$ sides coincide with the ending sides of each N^{ε}_i. The composite is easily visualized when $r = 0$, $r' = 1$, and there is one extent x:



The case of $r = 1$ and $r' = 0$ is symmetric, swapping the roles of the cap and the composite.

When the starting dimension is $r = 0$ (or, analogously, $r = 1$) and the ending dimension is $r' = y$, where y does not occur in M, the Kan composition yields the interior of the x, y-square depicted above, called the *filler*. One may think of this composition as sweeping out that square by sliding the cap from $y = 0$ to any point in the y dimension, much in the manner of opening a window shade. The filler is simultaneously an x-line identifying the two tube sides with each other, and a y-line identifying the cap with the composite.

[1] If $r_i = x$ and x occurs in N^{ε}_i, then the tube sides are actually $N^{\varepsilon}_i\langle \varepsilon/x\rangle$ for $\varepsilon = 0, 1$, representing that $x = \varepsilon$ on the N^{ε} side of the composition problem. In the present description, we assume that x does not occur in N^{ε}; the precise typing rules for Kan composition are given in Definition 17.

When $r = y$ and r' is 0 or 1, the composition may be visualized as closing a window shade, starting in the "middle" and heading towards the roll at one end or the other. When both r and r' are dimension names, the result is harder to visualize, and is best understood formally, as is also the case where $r = 0$ and $r' = y$ but y does occur in M.

Finally, there are two cases in which the composition scenario trivializes. When $r = r' = 0$ or $r = r' = 1$, the composition is the cap itself, intuitively because the window shade does not move from its starting position at the cap. When an extent r_i is 0 (or 1), rather than a dimension name, the composition is simply $N_i^0\langle r'/y\rangle$ (or $N_i^1\langle r'/y\rangle$), because the composition has no extent beyond that end point. These two cases are important because they ensure, respectively, that the y and x end points of the x, y-filler are as depicted above.

2.1 Terms

$$\begin{aligned} M := {} & (a{:}A) \to B \mid (a{:}A) \times B \mid \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(M, N) \mid \mathsf{bool} \mid \mathsf{not}_r \mid \mathbb{S}^1 \\ & \mid \lambda a.M \mid \mathsf{app}(M, N) \mid \langle M, N\rangle \mid \mathsf{fst}(M) \mid \mathsf{snd}(M) \mid \langle x\rangle M \mid M@r \\ & \mid \mathsf{true} \mid \mathsf{false} \mid \mathsf{if}_{a.A}(M; N_1, N_2) \mid \mathsf{notel}_r(M) \\ & \mid \mathsf{base} \mid \mathsf{loop}_r \mid \mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(M; N_1, x.N_2) \\ & \mid \mathsf{coe}_{x.A}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}(M) \mid \mathsf{hcom}_A^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \end{aligned}$$

We use capital letters like M, N, and A to denote terms, r, r', r_i to denote dimension terms, x to denote dimension names, ε to denote dimension constants (0 or 1), and $\overline{\varepsilon}$ to denote the opposite dimension constant of ε. We write $x.-$ for dimension binders, $a.-$ for term binders, and $\mathsf{FD}(M)$ for the set of dimension names free in M. (Additionally, in $(a{:}A) \to B$ and $(a{:}A) \times B$, a is bound in B.) Dimension substitution $M\langle r/x\rangle$ and term substitution $M[N/a]$ are defined in the usual way.

The superscript argument of hcom is a list of $n \geq 1$ dimension terms $\overrightarrow{r_i} = r_1, \ldots, r_n$; it then takes $2n$ term arguments with one dimension binder each, $\overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon} = y.N_1^0, y.N_1^1, \ldots, y.N_n^0, y.N_n^1$. We use the $\overrightarrow{-}$ notation to abbreviate a list of the appropriate length, or to abbreviate applying some term formers to each term in that list.

We employ two abbreviations in the operational semantics below:

$$\mathsf{not}(M) := \mathsf{if}_{_.\mathsf{bool}}(M; \mathsf{false}, \mathsf{true})$$

$$\mathsf{com}_{y.A}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) := \mathsf{hcom}_{A\langle r'/y\rangle}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{coe}_{y.A}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{coe}_{y.A}^{y\rightsquigarrow r'}(N_i^\varepsilon)})$$

2.2 Operational semantics

The following describes a deterministic weak head reduction evaluation strategy for closed terms in the form of a transition system with two judgments:

1. $E\ \mathsf{val}$, stating that E is a *value*, or *canonical form*.
2. $E \longmapsto E'$, stating that E takes *one step of evaluation* to E'.

These judgments are defined so that if $E\ \mathsf{val}$, then $E \not\longmapsto$, but the converse need not be the case. As usual, we write $E \longmapsto^* E'$ to mean that E transitions to E' in zero or more steps. We say E evaluates to V, written $E \Downarrow V$, when $E \longmapsto^* V$ and $V\ \mathsf{val}$.

Most of the evaluation rules are standard, and evaluate only principal arguments of elimination forms. The principal arguments of hcom and coe are their type subscripts, whose head constructors determine how those terms evaluate.

Determinacy is a strong condition that implies that a term has at most one value.

Lemma 2 (Determinacy)**.** *If $M \longmapsto M_1$ and $M \longmapsto M_2$, then $M_1 = M_2$.*

Stability states that evaluation does not introduce any new dimension names.

Lemma 3 (Stability)**.** *If $M \longmapsto M'$, then $\mathsf{FD}(M') \subseteq \mathsf{FD}(M)$.*

Types

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{not}_\varepsilon \longmapsto \mathsf{bool}}$$

$$\frac{}{(a{:}A) \to B\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{(a{:}A) \times B\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{Id}_{a.A}(M,N)\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{not}_x\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{\mathbb{S}^1\ \mathsf{val}}$$

Hcom/coe

$$\frac{A \longmapsto A'}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A}(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A'}(M)}$$

$$\frac{A \longmapsto A'}{\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \longmapsto \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A'}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})}$$

Dependent function types

$$\frac{M \longmapsto M'}{\mathsf{app}(M,N) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(M',N)} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{app}(\lambda a.M, N) \longmapsto M[N/a]} \qquad \frac{}{\lambda a.M\ \mathsf{val}}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{(a:A)\to B}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \longmapsto \lambda a.\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{B}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{app}(M,a); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon, a)})}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.(a:A)\to B}(M) \longmapsto \lambda a.\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.B[\mathsf{coe}^{r' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A}(a)/a]}(\mathsf{app}(M, \mathsf{coe}^{r' \rightsquigarrow r}_{x.A}(a)))}$$

Dependent pair types

$$\frac{M \longmapsto M'}{\mathsf{fst}(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{fst}(M')} \qquad \frac{M \longmapsto M'}{\mathsf{snd}(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{snd}(M')} \qquad \frac{}{\langle M, N\rangle\ \mathsf{val}}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{fst}(\langle M, N\rangle) \longmapsto M} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{snd}(\langle M, N\rangle) \longmapsto N}$$

$$\frac{F = \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A}(r \rightsquigarrow z, \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)})}{\begin{array}{c}\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{(a:A)\times B}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \\ \longmapsto \\ \langle \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)}), \mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{z.B[F/a]}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{snd}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{snd}(N_i^\varepsilon)})\rangle\end{array}}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.(a:A)\times B}(M) \longmapsto \langle \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A}(\mathsf{fst}(M)), \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.B[\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A}(\mathsf{fst}(M))/a]}(\mathsf{snd}(M))\rangle}$$

Identification types

$$\frac{M \longmapsto M'}{M@r \longmapsto M'@r} \qquad \frac{}{(\langle x \rangle M)@r \longmapsto M\langle r/x \rangle} \qquad \frac{}{\langle x \rangle M \ \mathsf{val}}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0,P_1)}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \longmapsto \langle x \rangle \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}, x}_{A}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M@x; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon@x}, _.P_0, _.P_1)}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.\mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0,P_1)}(M) \longmapsto \langle x \rangle \mathsf{com}^{x}_{y.A}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M@x; y.P_0, y.P_1)}$$

Booleans

$$\frac{\overrightarrow{r_i} = x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, \varepsilon, r_{i+1}, \ldots, r_n}{\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \longmapsto N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y \rangle} \qquad \frac{r = r'}{\mathsf{hcom}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \longmapsto M}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{true}\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{false}\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{r \neq r'}{\mathsf{hcom}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})\ \mathsf{val}}$$

$$\frac{M \longmapsto M'}{\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(M; T, F) \longmapsto \mathsf{if}_{a.A}(M'; T, F)} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(\mathsf{true}; T, F) \longmapsto T} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(\mathsf{false}; T, F) \longmapsto F}$$

$$\frac{r \neq r' \quad H = \mathsf{hcom}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow z, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})}{\begin{array}{c}\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(\mathsf{hcom}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}); T, F) \\ \longmapsto \\ \mathsf{com}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{z.A[H/a]}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{if}_{a.A}(M; T, F); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(N_i^\varepsilon; T, F)})\end{array}}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{bool}}(M) \longmapsto M}$$

Circle

$$\frac{\overrightarrow{r_i} = x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, \varepsilon, r_{i+1}, \ldots, r_n}{\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \longmapsto N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y \rangle} \qquad \frac{r = r'}{\mathsf{hcom}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \longmapsto M}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{loop}_\varepsilon \longmapsto \mathsf{base}} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{base}\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{loop}_x\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{r \neq r'}{\mathsf{hcom}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})\ \mathsf{val}}$$

$$\frac{M \longmapsto M'}{\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(M; P, x.L) \longmapsto \mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(M'; P, x.L)}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(\mathsf{base}; P, x.L) \longmapsto P} \qquad \frac{}{\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(\mathsf{loop}_w; P, x.L) \longmapsto L\langle w/x \rangle}$$

$$\frac{r \neq r' \quad F = \mathsf{hcom}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow z, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})}{\begin{array}{c}\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(\mathsf{hcom}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}); P, x.L) \\ \longmapsto \\ \mathsf{com}^{x_1,\ldots,x_n}_{z.A[F/a]}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(M; P, x.L); \overrightarrow{y.\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(N_i^\varepsilon; P, x.L)})\end{array}}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathbb{S}^1}(M) \longmapsto M}$$

Not

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{notel}_x(M)\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{notel}_0(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M)} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{notel}_1(M) \longmapsto M}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon \rightsquigarrow \overline{\varepsilon}}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M)} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon \rightsquigarrow \varepsilon}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M) \longmapsto M}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{0 \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_x(\mathsf{not}(M))} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{1 \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_x(M)}$$

$$\frac{M \longmapsto M'}{\mathsf{coe}^{x \rightsquigarrow r}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{coe}^{x \rightsquigarrow r}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M')} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{x \rightsquigarrow r}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_x(M)) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_r(M)} \qquad \frac{x \neq y}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{not}_y}(M) \longmapsto M}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{not}_w}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_w(\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{coe}^{w \rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{coe}^{w \rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(N_i^\varepsilon)}))}$$

3 Meaning explanations

Definition 4. We say M tm $[\Psi]$ when M is a term with no free term variables, and $\mathsf{FD}(M) \subseteq \Psi$.

Remark 5. We write M val $[\Psi]$ when M tm $[\Psi]$ and M val. Being a value does not depend on the choice of Ψ, so whenever M val $[\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{FD}(M) \subseteq \Psi'$, we also have M val $[\Psi']$.

Definition 6. A total dimension substitution $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ assigns to each dimension name in Ψ either 0, 1, or a dimension name in Ψ'. It follows that if M tm $[\Psi]$ then $M\psi$ tm $[\Psi']$.

In this paper, we define the judgments of higher type theory as arising from two families of partial equivalence relations on values: $- \approx^{-} -$, which will determine when two (pre)types are equal, and $- \approx^{-}_{-} -$, which will determine when two elements of a (pre)type are equal. We call such a pair of relations a cubical type system. (We employ PERs as a convenient method of describing sets equipped with an equivalence relation; elements of the corresponding set are the values that are related to themselves.)

Definition 7. A *cubical type system* consists of

1. For every Ψ, a symmetric and transitive relation $- \approx^{\Psi} -$ over values A val $[\Psi]$, and
2. For every $A \approx^{\Psi} B$, symmetric and transitive relations $- \approx^{\Psi}_{A} -$ and $- \approx^{\Psi}_{B} -$ over values M val $[\Psi]$, such that $M \approx^{\Psi}_{A} N$ if and only if $M \approx^{\Psi}_{B} N$.

Remark 8. We write $A \sim^{\Psi} B$ when $A \Downarrow A_0$, $B \Downarrow B_0$, and $A_0 \approx^{\Psi} B_0$, and we write $M \sim^{\Psi}_{A} N$ when $M \Downarrow M_0$, $N \Downarrow N_0$, $A \Downarrow A_0$, and $M_0 \approx^{\Psi}_{A_0} N_0$.

3.1 Closed judgments

We proceed by defining what it means for our core judgments to hold in any cubical type system. (In Section 4 we use these judgments to describe desirable properties of cubical type systems, for example, being closed under certain type formers.)

The presuppositions of a judgment are the facts that must be true before one can even sensibly state that judgment. For example, in Definition 10 below, we presuppose that A is a pretype when defining what it means for M and N to be equal elements of A; if A is not a pretype, then the PERs considered in that definition may not even be defined.

Approximately, a term A is a pretype at Ψ when $A\psi \sim^{\Psi'} A\psi$ for every $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$. A term M is an element of a pretype A at Ψ when $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{A\psi} M\psi$ for every $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$. We also demand that pretypes and their elements have *coherent aspects*, a technical condition implying that dimension substitutions can be taken simultaneously or sequentially, before or after evaluating a term, without affecting the outcome, up to PER equality. (In our postfix notation for dimension substitutions, $A\psi_1\psi_2$ means $(A\psi_1)\psi_2$.)

Definition 9. We say $A \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$, presupposing A tm $[\Psi]$ and B tm $[\Psi]$, when for any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$,

1. $A\psi_1 \Downarrow A_1$, $A_1\psi_2 \Downarrow A_2$, $A\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow A_{12}$,
2. $B\psi_1 \Downarrow B_1$, $B_1\psi_2 \Downarrow B_2$, $B\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow B_{12}$, and

3. $A_2 \approx^{\Psi_2} A_{12} \approx^{\Psi_2} B_2 \approx^{\Psi_2} B_{12}$.

Definition 10. We say $M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$, presupposing $A \doteq A$ pretype $[\Psi]$, M tm $[\Psi]$, and N tm $[\Psi]$, when for any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$,

1. $M\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1$, $M_1\psi_2 \Downarrow M_2$, $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow M_{12}$,
2. $N\psi_1 \Downarrow N_1$, $N_1\psi_2 \Downarrow N_2$, $N\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow N_{12}$, and
3. $M_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} M_{12} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} N_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} N_{12}$, where $A\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow A_{12}$.

Remark 11. We write A pretype $[\Psi]$ when $A \doteq A$ pretype $[\Psi]$, and we write $M \in A\ [\Psi]$ when $M \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]$. (We will similarly abbreviate further judgments without further comment.)

Remark 12. The judgments $A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi]$ and $M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$ are symmetric and transitive. Therefore, if $A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi]$ then A pretype $[\Psi]$ and B pretype $[\Psi]$, and if $M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$ then $M \in A\ [\Psi]$ and $N \in A\ [\Psi]$.

If no terms in our programming language contained dimension subterms, then we would have $M = M\psi$ for all M. The above meaning explanations would therefore collapse into: A pretype $[\Psi]$ whenever $A \sim^{\Psi'} A$ for all Ψ', and $M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$ whenever $M \sim^{\Psi'}_A N$ for all Ψ'. Disregarding Ψ', these are precisely the ordinary meaning explanations for computational type theory.

In order to accurately capture higher-dimensional structures, we restrict our attention to pretypes satisfying the additional conditions of being *cubical* (ensuring their PERs are functorially indexed by the cube category) and *Kan* (ensuring they validate the hcom and coe rules). This Kan condition is most easily expressed using judgments augmented by *dimension context restrictions*.

Definition 13. For any Ψ and set of unoriented equations $\Xi = (r_1 = r'_1, \ldots, r_n = r'_n)$ in Ψ (that is, $\mathsf{FD}(\overrightarrow{r_i}, \overrightarrow{r'_i}) \subseteq \Psi$), we say that $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ *satisfies* Ξ if $r_i\psi = r'_i\psi$ for each $i \in [1, n]$.

Definition 14. We say $A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi \mid \Xi]$, presupposing A tm $[\Psi]$, B tm $[\Psi]$, and Ξ is a set of equations in Ψ, when for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ satisfying Ξ, $A\psi \doteq B\psi$ pretype $[\Psi']$.

Definition 15. We say $M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi \mid \Xi]$, presupposing A pretype $[\Psi \mid \Xi]$, M tm $[\Psi]$, N tm $[\Psi]$, and Ξ is a set of equations in Ψ, when for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ satisfying Ξ, $M\psi \doteq N\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$.

Notice that $A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi]$ if and only if for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $A\psi \doteq B\psi$ pretype $[\Psi']$. Thus if $A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi]$, then $A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi \mid \Xi]$, and the converse is true when Ξ is satisfied by all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ (for example, when Ξ is empty).

Definition 16. We say A pretype $[\Psi]$ is *cubical* if for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{A_0} N$ (where $A\psi \Downarrow A_0$), $M \doteq N \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$.

Definition 17. We say A, B are *equally Kan*, presupposing $A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi]$, if the following five conditions hold:

1. For any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if
   (a) $M \doteq O \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$,
   (b) $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in A\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i \in [1, n]$, $j \in [1, n]$, $\varepsilon = 0, 1$, and $\varepsilon' = 0, 1$,
   (c) $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in A\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any $i \in [1, n]$ and $\varepsilon = 0, 1$, and

(d) $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in A\psi\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any $i \in [1,n]$ and $\varepsilon = 0,1$,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon}) \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$.

2. For any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if

   (a) $M \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$,

   (b) $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in A\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i \in [1,n]$, $j \in [1,n]$, $\varepsilon = 0,1$, and $\varepsilon' = 0,1$, and

   (c) $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in A\psi\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any $i \in [1,n]$ and $\varepsilon = 0,1$,

   then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$.

3. For any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, under the same conditions as above, if $r_i = \varepsilon$ for some i then

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in A\psi\ [\Psi'].$$

4. For any $\psi : (\Psi', x) \to \Psi$, if $M \doteq N \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A\psi}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.B\psi}(N) \in A\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$.

5. For any $\psi : (\Psi', x) \to \Psi$, if $M \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.A\psi}(M) \doteq M \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$.

Definition 18. We say $A \doteq B\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, presupposing $A \doteq B\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$, when A and B are cubical and equally Kan.

The judgment $A \doteq B\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$ is symmetric and transitive because the Kan conditions are.

3.2 Open judgments

We extend these judgments to open terms by functionality, that is, an open pretype (resp., element of a pretype) is an open term that sends equal elements of the pretypes in the context to equal closed pretypes (resp., elements). The open judgments are defined simultaneously, stratified by the length of the context. (We assume the variables $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ in a context are distinct.)

Definition 19. We say $(a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_n : A_n)\ \mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi]$ when

$$A_1\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi],$$
$$a_1 : A_1 \gg A_2\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi], \ldots$$
$$\text{and } a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_{n-1} : A_{n-1} \gg A_n\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi].$$

Definition 20. We say $a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_n : A_n \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$, presupposing $(a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_n : A_n)\ \mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi]$, when for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and any

$$N_1 \doteq N_1' \in A_1\psi\ [\Psi'],$$
$$N_2 \doteq N_2' \in A_2\psi[N_1/a_1]\ [\Psi'], \ldots$$
$$\text{and } N_n \doteq N_n' \in A_n\psi[N_1, \ldots, N_{n-1}/a_1, \ldots, a_n]\ [\Psi'],$$

we have $B\psi[N_1, \ldots, N_n/a_1, \ldots, a_n] \doteq B'\psi[N_1', \ldots, N_n'/a_1, \ldots, a_n]\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi']$.

Definition 21. We say $a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_n : A_n \gg M \doteq M' \in B\ [\Psi]$, presupposing $a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_n : A_n \gg B\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$, when for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and any

$$N_1 \doteq N_1' \in A_1\psi\ [\Psi'],$$
$$N_2 \doteq N_2' \in A_2\psi[N_1/a_1]\ [\Psi'], \ldots$$
$$\text{and } N_n \doteq N_n' \in A_n\psi[N_1, \ldots, N_{n-1}/a_1, \ldots, a_n]\ [\Psi'],$$

we have $M\psi[N_1, \ldots, N_n/a_1, \ldots, a_n] \doteq M'\psi[N_1', \ldots, N_n'/a_1, \ldots, a_n] \in B\psi[N_1, \ldots, N_n/a_1, \ldots, a_n]\ [\Psi']$.

One should read $[\Psi]$ as extending across the entire judgment, as it specifies the starting dimension at which to consider not only B and M but Γ as well. The open judgments, like the closed judgments, are symmetric and transitive. In particular, if $\Gamma \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ then $\Gamma \gg B\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$. As a result, the earlier hypotheses of each definition ensure that later hypotheses are sensible; for example, $(a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_n : A_n)\ \mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi]$ and $N_1 \in A_1\psi\ [\Psi']$ ensure that $A_2\psi[N_1/a_1]\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi']$.

Finally, we extend the notions of context restriction and of being a type to open pretypes and elements in a straightforward fashion. (Definition 22 requires the open judgments to be closed under dimension substitution, which we prove in Lemma 26.)

Definition 22.

1. We say $\Gamma\ \mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi \mid \Xi]$, presupposing Ξ is a set of equations in Ψ, when for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ satisfying Ξ, $\Gamma\psi\ \mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi']$.
2. We say $\Gamma \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi \mid \Xi]$, presupposing $\Gamma\ \mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi \mid \Xi]$ and Ξ is a set of equations in Ψ, when for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ satisfying Ξ, $\Gamma\psi \gg B\psi \doteq B'\psi\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi']$.
3. We say $\Gamma \gg M \doteq M' \in B\ [\Psi \mid \Xi]$, presupposing $\Gamma\ \mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi \mid \Xi]$, $\Gamma \gg B\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi \mid \Xi]$, and Ξ is a set of equations in Ψ, when for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ satisfying Ξ, $\Gamma\psi \gg M\psi \doteq M'\psi \in B\psi\ [\Psi']$.

Definition 23. We say $a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_n : A_n \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, presupposing $a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_n : A_n \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$, when for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and any

$$N_1 \doteq N_1' \in A_1\psi\ [\Psi'],$$
$$N_2 \doteq N_2' \in A_2\psi[N_1/a_1]\ [\Psi'], \ldots$$
$$\text{and } N_n \doteq N_n' \in A_n\psi[N_1, \ldots, N_{n-1}/a_1, \ldots, a_n]\ [\Psi'],$$

we have $B\psi[N_1, \ldots, N_n/a_1, \ldots, a_n] \doteq B'\psi[N_1', \ldots, N_n'/a_1, \ldots, a_n]\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi']$.

3.3 Basic lemmas

We prove some basic results about our core judgments before proceeding.

Lemma 24 (Head expansion)**.** *If $M' \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$ and for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $M\psi \longmapsto^* M'\psi$, then $M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$.*

Proof. For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, we know $M_2' \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} M_{12}' \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} N_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} N_{12}$ where $A\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow A_{12}$. Therefore it suffices to show $M_{12}' \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} M_{12}$ and $M_2' \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} M_2$. The former is true because $M\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* M'\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow M_{12}'$ and $M_{12}' \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} M_{12}'$. The latter is true because $M\psi_1 \longmapsto^* M'\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1'$, $M_1'\psi_2 \Downarrow M_2'$, and $M_2' \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} M_2'$. ∎

A special case of this lemma is that if $M' \in A\ [\Psi]$ then $M \in A\ [\Psi]$.

Lemma 25. *If $M \in A\ [\Psi]$, $N \in A\ [\Psi]$, and for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{A\psi} N\psi$, then $M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$.*

Proof. For all $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, by $M \in A\ [\Psi]$ we have $M\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1$ and $M_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M\psi_1\psi_2$, and by $N \in A\ [\Psi]$ we have $N\psi_1 \Downarrow N_1$ and $N_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N\psi_1\psi_2$. Therefore it suffices to show $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N\psi_1\psi_2$, which follows from our assumption at $\psi = \psi_1\psi_2$. □

Lemma 26. *For any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$,*

1. *if $M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$ then $M\psi \doteq N\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$;*
2. *if $A \doteq B$ $\mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$ then $A\psi \doteq B\psi$ $\mathsf{type}\ [\Psi']$;*
3. *if Γ $\mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi]$ then $\Gamma\psi$ $\mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi']$;*
4. *if $\Gamma \gg A \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ then $\Gamma\psi \gg A\psi \doteq B\psi$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi']$;*
5. *if $\Gamma \gg M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$ then $\Gamma\psi \gg M\psi \doteq N\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$; and*
6. *if $\Gamma \gg A \doteq B$ $\mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$ then $\Gamma\psi \gg A\psi \doteq B\psi$ $\mathsf{type}\ [\Psi']$.*

Proof. We have already observed that if A $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ then $A\psi$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi']$. Exact equality is closed under dimension substitution for the same reason: its definition quantifies over all dimension substitutions. Similarly, equal types are equally Kan cubical pretypes, and both of these conditions are closed under dimension substitution.

Propositions (3), (4), and (5) are proven simultaneously by induction on the length of Γ. If $\Gamma = \cdot$, then (3) is trivial, and (4) and (5) follow because the closed judgments are closed under dimension substitution. The inductive steps for all three use all three inductive hypotheses. Proposition (6) follows similarly. □

The open judgments satisfy the *structural rules* of type theory, like hypothesis and weakening.

Lemma 27 (Hypothesis)**.** *If $(\Gamma, a_i : A_i, \Gamma')$ $\mathsf{ctx}\ [\Psi]$ then $\Gamma, a_i : A_i, \Gamma' \gg a_i \in A_i\ [\Psi]$.*

Proof. We must show for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and equal elements $N_1, N_1', \ldots, N_n, N_n'$ of the pretypes in $(\Gamma\psi, a_i : A_i\psi, \Gamma'\psi)$, that $N_i \doteq N_i' \in A_i\psi\ [\Psi']$. But this is exactly our assumption about N_i, N_i'. □

Lemma 28 (Weakening)**.**

1. *If $\Gamma, \Gamma' \gg B \doteq B'$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ and $\Gamma \gg A$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$, then $\Gamma, a : A, \Gamma' \gg B \doteq B'$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$.*
2. *If $\Gamma, \Gamma' \gg M \doteq M' \in B\ [\Psi]$ and $\Gamma \gg A$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$, then $\Gamma, a : A, \Gamma' \gg M \doteq M' \in B\ [\Psi]$.*

Proof. For the first part, we must show for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and equal elements

$$N_1 \doteq N_1' \in A_1\psi\ [\Psi'],$$
$$N_2 \doteq N_2' \in A_2\psi[N_1/a_1]\ [\Psi'], \ldots$$
$$N \doteq N' \in A\psi[N_1, \ldots/a_1, \ldots]\ [\Psi'], \ldots$$
$$\text{and } N_n \doteq N_n' \in A_n\psi[N_1, \ldots, N, \ldots, N_{n-1}/a_1, \ldots, a, \ldots, a_n]\ [\Psi'],$$

that the corresponding instances of B, B' are equal closed pretypes. By $\Gamma, \Gamma' \gg B \doteq B'$ pretype $[\Psi]$ we know that $a \# \Gamma', B, B'$—since the contained pretypes become closed when substituting for $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. It also gives us $B\psi[N_1, \ldots/a_1, \ldots] \doteq B'\psi[N_1', \ldots/a_1, \ldots]$ pretype $[\Psi']$ which are the desired instances of B, B' because $a \# B, B'$. The second part follows similarly. □

The definition of equal pretypes was chosen to ensure that equal pretypes have equal elements.

Lemma 29. *If* $A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi]$ *and* $M \doteq N \in A$ $[\Psi]$ *then* $M \doteq N \in B$ $[\Psi]$.

Proof. For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, by the first hypothesis we have that $A\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow A_{12}$, $B\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow B_{12}$, and $A_{12} \sim^{\Psi_2} B_{12}$; by the second hypothesis, we have that $M_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} M_{12} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} N_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{A_{12}} N_{12}$. But this implies $M_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{B_{12}} M_{12} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{B_{12}} N_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{B_{12}} N_{12}$. □

Lemma 30. *If* $\Gamma \gg A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi]$ *and* $\Gamma \gg M \doteq N \in A$ $[\Psi]$ *then* $\Gamma \gg M \doteq N \in B$ $[\Psi]$.

Proof. If $\Gamma = (a_1 : A_1, \ldots, a_n : A_n)$ then $\Gamma \gg M \doteq N \in A$ $[\Psi]$ means that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and equal elements $N_1, N_1', \ldots, N_n, N_n'$ of the pretypes in $\Gamma\psi$, the corresponding instances of M and N are equal in $A\psi[N_1, \ldots, N_n/a_1, \ldots, a_n]$. But $\Gamma \gg A \doteq B$ pretype $[\Psi]$ implies this pretype is equal to $B\psi[N_1, \ldots, N_n/a_1, \ldots, a_n]$, so the result follows by Lemma 29. □

The context-restricted judgments have many of the same properties as the ordinary judgments.

Lemma 31. *For any* $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, *if* $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi \mid \Xi]$ *then* $\mathcal{J}\psi$ $[\Psi' \mid \Xi\psi]$, *where* $\mathcal{J}$ *is any dimension-context-restricted judgment.*

Proof. We are given that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ satisfying Ξ, $\mathcal{J}\psi$ $[\Psi']$; and want to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$ satisfying $\Xi\psi$, that $\mathcal{J}\psi\psi'$ $[\Psi'']$. It suffices to show that if ψ' satisfies $\Xi\psi$, then $\psi\psi'$ satisfies Ξ. But these are both true if and only if for each equation $r_i = r_i'$ in Ξ, $r_i\psi\psi' = r_i'\psi\psi'$. □

Lemma 32. *If* $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi]$ *then* $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi \mid \Xi]$.

Proof. By Lemma 26, we know that $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi]$ implies that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathcal{J}\psi$ $[\Psi']$. Therefore, for any ψ satisfying Ξ, $\mathcal{J}\psi$ $[\Psi']$. □

Remark 33. Although we define $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi \mid \Xi]$ for general Ξ, Definition 17 only uses 18 distinct Ξ (given that we consider them modulo permutation and duplication). Moreover, this class of Ξ are closed under dimension substitution. They fall into three categories:

1. Three Ξ are satisfied by *all* ψ, for example $(0 = 0, 1 = 1)$. In these cases, $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi \mid \Xi]$ if and only if $\mathcal{J}\psi$ $[\Psi']$ for all ψ, which by Lemma 26 holds if and only if $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi]$.
2. Six are satisfied by *no* ψ, for example $(0 = x, 1 = x)$. In these cases, $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi \mid \Xi]$ always.
3. The remaining nine can be reduced to a substitution instance of $\mathcal{J}$, because any ψ satisfying Ξ can be factored through a one- or two-variable dimension substitution.
   (a) For $(\varepsilon = x, \varepsilon' = \varepsilon')$ and $(\varepsilon = x)$, $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi, x \mid \Xi]$ if and only if $\mathcal{J}\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle$ $[\Psi]$.
   (b) For $(\varepsilon = x, \varepsilon' = y)$, $\mathcal{J}$ $[\Psi, x, y \mid \Xi]$ if and only if $\mathcal{J}\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\langle\varepsilon'/y\rangle$ $[\Psi]$.

Therefore one can think of the context-restricted judgments as merely a notational device for avoiding the above case-split when expressing the Kan condition.

In Definition 17 we defined closed Kan pretypes as ones with closed hcom and coe elements; in Definition 23 we defined open types as open pretypes whose instances are all cubical and Kan. Because dimension and term substitutions commute with hcom and coe, it follows that open types have open hcom elements. (Open versions of the four other Kan conditions also hold for open types, but we do not state them here.)

Lemma 34. *If* $\Gamma \gg A \doteq B\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$ *then if*

1. $\Gamma \gg M \doteq O \in A\ [\Psi]$,
2. $\Gamma \gg N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in A\ [\Psi, y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ *for any* $i \in [1,n]$, $j \in [1,n]$, $\varepsilon = 0,1$, *and* $\varepsilon' = 0,1$,
3. $\Gamma \gg N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in A\ [\Psi, y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ *for any* $i \in [1,n]$ *and* $\varepsilon = 0,1$, *and*
4. $\Gamma \gg N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ *for any* $i \in [1,n]$ *and* $\varepsilon = 0,1$,

then $\Gamma \gg \mathsf{hcom}_A^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{hcom}_B^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon}) \in A\ [\Psi]$.

Proof. Let $\Gamma = (a_1 : A_1, \dots, a_n : A_n)$. We need to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and $N_1 \doteq N_1' \in A_1\psi\ [\Psi']$, …, we have

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi}}_{A\psi[N_1,\dots/a_1,\dots]}(r\psi \rightsquigarrow r'\psi, M\psi[N_1,\dots/a_1,\dots]; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi[N_1,\dots/a_1,\dots]}) \doteq \dots \in A\psi[N_1,\dots/a_1,\dots]\ [\Psi'].$$

We prove this using the first Kan condition of the corresponding closed instances of A, B; the only difficulty is showing that the open context-restricted hypotheses of this lemma imply the necessary closed context-restricted equalities.

Consider $\Gamma \gg N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in A\ [\Psi, y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$. By Lemma 31 we know $\Gamma\psi \gg N_i^\varepsilon\psi \doteq P_i^\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i\psi = \varepsilon]$. Therefore, for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to (\Psi', y)$ satisfying $r_i\psi = \varepsilon$, $\Gamma\psi\psi' \gg N_i^\varepsilon\psi\psi' \doteq P_i^\varepsilon\psi\psi' \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$. By Lemma 26 we know that $N_1\psi' \doteq N_1'\psi' \in A_1\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$, …, so we get

$$N_i^\varepsilon\psi\psi'[N_1\psi', \dots/a_1, \dots] \doteq P_i^\varepsilon\psi\psi'[N_1'\psi', \dots/a_1, \dots] \in A\psi\psi'[N_1\psi', \dots/a_1, \dots]\ [\Psi'']$$

or, by commuting substitutions,

$$N_i^\varepsilon\psi[N_1, \dots/a_1, \dots]\psi' \doteq P_i^\varepsilon\psi[N_1', \dots/a_1, \dots]\psi' \in A\psi[N_1, \dots/a_1, \dots]\psi'\ [\Psi''].$$

Since this holds for all ψ' satisfying $r_i\psi = \varepsilon$, it implies

$$N_i^\varepsilon\psi[N_1, \dots/a_1, \dots] \doteq P_i^\varepsilon\psi[N_1', \dots/a_1, \dots] \in A\psi[N_1, \dots/a_1, \dots]\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i\psi = \varepsilon]$$

which is exactly what we needed. The other hypotheses similarly follow. ∎

Finally, while the Kan conditions only directly define *homogeneous* composition, in the sense that the type A must be degenerate in the bound direction of the tubes, we can combine homogeneous composition and coercion to obtain *heterogeneous* composition, written com and defined:

$$\mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{y.A}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) := \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\langle r'/y\rangle}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A}(N_i^\varepsilon)})$$

which satisfies the following properties.

Theorem 35. *If $A \doteq B$ type $[\Psi]$, then:*

1. *For any $\psi : (\Psi', y) \to \Psi$, if*

   (a) $M \doteq O \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle$ $[\Psi']$,
   (b) $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in A\psi$ $[\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ *for any* $i \in [1,n]$, $j \in [1,n]$, $\varepsilon = 0,1$, *and* $\varepsilon' = 0,1$,
   (c) $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in A\psi$ $[\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ *for any* $i \in [1,n]$ *and* $\varepsilon = 0,1$, *and*
   (d) $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle$ $[\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ *for any* $i \in [1,n]$ *and* $\varepsilon = 0,1$,

   then $\mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{y.A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{y.B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon}) \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle$ $[\Psi']$.

2. *For any $\psi : (\Psi', y) \to \Psi$, if*

   (a) $M \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle$ $[\Psi']$,
   (b) $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in A\psi$ $[\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ *for any* $i \in [1,n]$, $j \in [1,n]$, $\varepsilon = 0,1$, *and* $\varepsilon' = 0,1$,
   (c) $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle$ $[\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ *for any* $i \in [1,n]$ *and* $\varepsilon = 0,1$,

   then $\mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{y.A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle$ $[\Psi']$.

3. *For any $\psi : (\Psi', y) \to \Psi$, under the same conditions as above, if $r_i = \varepsilon$ for some i then*

$$\mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle \ [\Psi'].$$

Proof. By the fourth Kan condition, the conditions in (1) above imply that for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,

1. $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A\psi}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.B\psi}(O) \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle$ $[\Psi']$,
2. $\mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A\psi}(N_i^\varepsilon) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A\psi}(N_j^{\varepsilon'}) \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle$ $[\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$,
3. $\mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A\psi}(N_i^\varepsilon) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.B\psi}(P_i^\varepsilon) \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle$ $[\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$, and
4. $(\mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A\psi}(N_i^\varepsilon))\langle r/y\rangle \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A\psi}(M) \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle$ $[\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$.

To prove this for the context-restricted judgments above, we use the fact that $N_i^\varepsilon\psi' \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'}\psi' \in A\psi\psi'$ $[\Psi'']$ for all $\psi' : \Psi'' \to (\Psi', y)$ satisfying $(r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon')$, and so

$$\mathsf{coe}^{y\psi'\rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{y.A\psi\psi'}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi') \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{y\psi'\rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{y.A\psi\psi'}(N_j^{\varepsilon'}\psi') \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle \ [\Psi'']$$

which implies the tube adjacency condition. The first Kan condition of A, B therefore gives us the first condition above.

For the second condition above, the second Kan condition of A gives us

$$\mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{y.A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{y.A\psi}(M) \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle \ [\Psi']$$

and by the fifth Kan condition, $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{y.A\psi}(M) \doteq M \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle$ $[\Psi']$.

For the third condition, the third Kan condition of A gives us

$$\mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq (\mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A\psi}(N_i^\varepsilon))\langle r'/y\rangle \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle \ [\Psi']$$

and again by the fifth Kan condition, $(\mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.A\psi}(N_i^\varepsilon))\langle r'/y\rangle \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle$ $[\Psi']$. □

An open version of this theorem also holds for open types.

4 Types

In Section 3 we explained how a cubical type system gives rise to the judgments of higher type theory. However, our interest is in type systems with (higher) inductive types, dependent functions and pairs, identification types, and so forth. In this section we will explain what it means for a cubical type system to have certain type formers, just as in category theory one explains what it means for a category to have, say, finite products.

For each type former, we will then prove that any cubical type system with that property validates the expected typing rules. For example, any cubical type system with dependent pairs will validate the usual formation, introduction, elimination, computation, and eta rules for that pretype, and moreover, the dependent pair pretypes will be cubical and Kan.

Finally, we will want to exhibit a cubical type system with all our desired type formers, and use it as a model for the rules in Section 5. A straightforward method is to produce the smallest cubical type system closed under the type formers, by means of a fixed point construction [Allen, 1987; Harper, 1992]. This is possible because the meanings of dependent function, pair, and identification types are parasitic on the meanings of their constituent types.

Note, however, that *any* such cubical type system suffices for our purposes; none of our theorems hold only in the least such. It should therefore be possible to extend our results with additional type formers (such as type universes, or more higher inductive types) without needing to reprove everything.

4.1 Booleans

We consider bool as a higher inductive type, meaning that we freely add Kan composites as higher cells, rather than specifying that all its higher cells are exactly true or false. We do this to demonstrate the robustness of our canonicity theorem and our treatment of not_x; in Appendix A, we define a type of "strict booleans" which may be more useful in practice.

A cubical type system *has booleans* if $\mathsf{bool} \approx^{\Psi} \mathsf{bool}$ for all Ψ, and $- \approx^{-}_{\mathsf{bool}} -$ is the least relation such that:

1. $\mathsf{true} \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{true}$,
2. $\mathsf{false} \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{false}$, and
3. $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon})$ whenever $r \neq r'$,
   (a) $M \doteq O \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$,
   (b) $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon, x_j = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
   (c) $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε, and
   (d) $N_i^\varepsilon \langle r/y \rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi \mid x_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε.

Note that this relation is symmetric because (a) and (c) imply that (b) and (d) also hold for P_i^ε and O. In this definition, each $- \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} -$ refers to all other $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} -$, because each equality judgment does. In the remainder of this subsection, we prove theorems about cubical type systems that have booleans.

Pretype bool pretype $[\Psi]$.

For all ψ_1, ψ_2, $\mathsf{bool}\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{bool}$, $\mathsf{bool}\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{bool}$, $\mathsf{bool}\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{bool}$, and $\mathsf{bool} \approx^{\Psi_2} \mathsf{bool}$.

Introduction $\mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{false} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$.

For all $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, $\mathsf{true}\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$, $\mathsf{true}\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$, $\mathsf{true}\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$, and $\mathsf{true} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{true}$. The false case is analogous.

Kan bool pretype $[\Psi]$ is Kan.

We prove only the unary version of the first Kan condition, to lessen the notational burden; the binary version follows easily. Show that for any Ψ', if

1. $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$. That is, for any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi'$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1 \Downarrow H_1$ and $H_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2$. We proceed by case-analyzing r, r', and $\overrightarrow{r_i}$ under ψ_1 and $\psi_1\psi_2$ to determine how $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1$ and $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2$ step.

1. $r_i\psi_1 = \varepsilon$ (where $r_k\psi_1$ is a dimension name for all $k < i$), and $r_j\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon'$ (where this is again the smallest such j).

   Then $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1 \longmapsto N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1\langle r'\psi_1/y\rangle = N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1$ and $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto N_j^{\varepsilon'}\psi_1\psi_2\langle r'\psi_1\psi_2/y\rangle = N_j^{\varepsilon'}\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2$. We know $N_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ and $r_i\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1 = \varepsilon$, so $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$ and thus $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1 \Downarrow H_1$ and $H_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2$.

   We also know that $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$, $r_i\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$, and $r_j\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon'$, so $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'}\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$, and thus $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_j^{\varepsilon'}\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2$. The result follows by transitivity.

2. All $r_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 = r'\psi_1$, and $r_i\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ (where this is the smallest i).

   Then $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1 \longmapsto M\psi_1$ and $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1\psi_2\langle r'\psi_1\psi_2/y\rangle = N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1\psi_2\langle r\psi_1\psi_2/y\rangle = N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2$. We know $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$ so $M\psi_1 \Downarrow H_1$ and $H_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$. We also know that $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ and $r_i\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$, so $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$, and thus $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$. The result again follows by transitivity.

3. All $r_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 = r'\psi_1$, and all $r_i\psi_1\psi_2$ are dimension names.

   Then $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1 \longmapsto M\psi_1$ and $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$ (since $r\psi_1\psi_2 = r'\psi_1\psi_2$). By $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$, $M\psi_1 \Downarrow H_1$ and $H_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$.

4. All $r_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 \neq r'\psi_1$, and $r_i\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ (where this is the smallest i).

   Then $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1$ val and $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1\psi_2\langle r'\psi_1\psi_2/y\rangle = N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2$. In this case $H_1 = \mathsf{hcom}\psi_1$, so $H_1\psi_2 = \mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2$ and we must show $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2$. We know $N_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ and $r_i\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$, so $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ and thus $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2$.

5. All $r_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 \neq r'\psi_1$, all $r_i\psi_1\psi_2$ are dimension names, and $r\psi_1\psi_2 = r'\psi_1\psi_2$.

   Then $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1$ val and $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$. By $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$, $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$.

6. All $r_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 \neq r'\psi_1$, all $r_i\psi_1\psi_2$ are dimension names, and $r\psi_1\psi_2 \neq r'\psi_1\psi_2$.

   Then $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1$ val, $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2$ val, and by Lemmas 26 and 31 we know $M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$, $N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'}\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2, y \mid r_i\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon, r_j\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and $N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1\psi_2\langle r\psi_1\psi_2/y\rangle \doteq M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2 \mid r_i\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε. Then because $r_i\psi_1\psi_2$ are all dimension names and $r\psi_1\psi_2 \neq r'\psi_1\psi_2$, the cubical type system having booleans directly implies $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2$.

The second Kan condition requires that for any Ψ', if

1. $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$. That is, if $r = r'$ then hcom is equal to its cap M.

By the first Kan condition, we already know that both sides are $- \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$. Thus by Lemma 25 it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, $\mathsf{hcom}\psi \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi$. There are two cases:

1. $r_i\psi = \varepsilon$ (where this is the smallest such i).

   Then $\mathsf{hcom}\psi \longmapsto N_i^\varepsilon\psi\langle r\psi/y\rangle = N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi$. We know $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ and $r_i\psi = \varepsilon$, so $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi \doteq M\psi \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi'']$, and thus $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi$.

2. All $r_i\psi$ are dimension names.

   Then $\mathsf{hcom}\psi \longmapsto M\psi$. By $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$, $M\psi \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi$.

The third Kan condition requires that for any Ψ', if $r_i = \varepsilon$ for some i,

1. $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$.

By the first Kan condition, we know that $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$. By hypothesis, $N_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$, but $r_i = \varepsilon$ so in fact $N_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y]$. Thus Lemma 25 applies, and it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, $\mathsf{hcom}\psi \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi$. Let j be the smallest index such that $r_j\psi = \varepsilon'$. We know $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$, $r_i\langle r'/y\rangle\psi = \varepsilon$, and $r_j\langle r'/y\rangle\psi = \varepsilon'$, so $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'}\langle r'/y\rangle\psi \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi'']$, and thus $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_j^{\varepsilon'}\langle r'/y\rangle\psi$.

The fourth Kan condition requires that for any Ψ', if $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{bool}}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{bool}}(N) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$. But $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi\rightsquigarrow r'\psi}_{x.\mathsf{bool}}(M\psi) \longmapsto M\psi$ for all ψ, so by Lemma 24, $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{bool}}(M) \doteq M \doteq N \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{bool}}(N)$.

The fifth Kan condition requires that for any Ψ', if $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.\mathsf{bool}}(M) \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$. This again follows immediately by Lemma 24.

Cubical For any Ψ' and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} N$, $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$.

There are three cases in which $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} N$. For true and false, this follows from the introduction rules already proven. For $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^{\varepsilon}}) \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^{\varepsilon}})$, this follows by the first Kan condition of bool, again already proven.

Elimination If $M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, $a : \mathsf{bool} \gg A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, $T \doteq T' \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$, and $F \doteq F' \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(M; T, F) \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.A'}(M'; T', F') \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]$.

The elimination rule is complicated to prove, because it requires that if applied to a value hcom in bool has coherent aspects, even though that hcom's aspects may be a different hcom or a different term altogether. In Lemma 36 we show the elimination rule holds on any elements of bool *if* the elimination rule holds on those elements' aspects. In Lemma 37 we use this to show that the elimination rule holds on *all* values in bool.

Lemma 36. *If*

1. $M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$ *such that for any* $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ *and* $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, *the elimination rule holds for any pair of the aspects* $M_2, M_{12}, M'_2, M'_{12}$ *of* M, M',
2. $a : \mathsf{bool} \gg A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$,
3. $T \doteq T' \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$, *and*
4. $F \doteq F' \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$,

then $\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(M; T, F) \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.A'}(M'; T', F') \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]$.

Proof. We carefully work through the unary version of the proof, i.e., that $\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(M; T, F) \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]$. (The full proof follows by repeating the argument for M', T', F'.) We show that for all $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, $\mathsf{if}\psi_1 \Downarrow I_1$ and $I_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[M/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2$.

By $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, we know $M\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1$, $M_1\psi_2 \Downarrow M_2$, $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow M_{12}$, $M_1 \approx^{\Psi_1}_{\mathsf{bool}} M_1$, and $M_{12} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M_2$. Since if evaluates its first argument, $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M\psi_1; T\psi_1, F\psi_1) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M_1; T\psi_1, F\psi_1)$, and by assumption, $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M_1; T\psi_1, F\psi_1) \in A\psi_1[M_1/a]\ [\Psi_1]$. This implies

$$\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M_1\psi_2; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M_2; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1[M_1/a]\psi_2} I_1\psi_2.$$

On the other hand, $\mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M_{12}; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2)$ so $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M_{12}; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M_2; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \in A\psi_1\psi_2[M_{12}/a]\ [\Psi_2]$ and these terms are $- \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2[M_{12}/a]} -$ also. Thus the result follows by transitivity once we show $A\psi_1\psi_2[M_1\psi_2/a] \sim^{\Psi_2} A\psi_1\psi_2[M_{12}/a]$ and $A\psi_1\psi_2[M_{12}/a] \sim^{\Psi_2} A\psi_1\psi_2[M\psi_1\psi_2/a]$.

The former holds because $M_1\psi_2 \doteq M_{12} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$, which follows from Lemma 25 because both sides are $- \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$ (since bool is cubical) and $M_1\psi_2\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M_{12}\psi$ for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi_2$ (since each side is $- \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2\psi$). The latter holds similarly. ☐

We prove Lemma 36 first because we will appeal to it in the proof of Lemma 37, using the induction hypotheses to satisfy the assumption about aspects. Note that in the statement of Lemma 37, $A[V/a]\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$ because bool is cubical and thus $V \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$.

Lemma 37. *If* $V \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} V'$, *then for any* $a : \mathsf{bool} \gg A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, $T \doteq T' \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$, *and* $F \doteq F' \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$, $\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(V; T, F) \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.A'}(V'; T', F') \in A[V/a]\ [\Psi]$.

Proof. By induction on $V \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} V'$.

1. $\mathsf{true} \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{true}$.

   For all ψ, $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi}(\mathsf{true}; T\psi, F\psi) \longmapsto T\psi$ and $\mathsf{if}_{a.A'\psi}(\mathsf{true}; T'\psi, F'\psi) \longmapsto T'\psi$. Thus by Lemma 24 on both sides, the result follows from $T \doteq T' \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$, which we have assumed.

2. $\mathsf{false} \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{false}$.

   This follows by Lemma 24 and $F \doteq F' \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$.

3. $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon})$, such that $r \neq r'$, $M \doteq O \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon, x_j = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε, and $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi \mid x_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε.

   We focus on the unary case, showing that for all $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, $\mathsf{if}\psi_1 \Downarrow I_1$ and $I_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[V/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2$. We case-analyze r, r', and $\overrightarrow{x_i}$ under ψ_1 and $\psi_1\psi_2$:

   (a) $x_i\psi_1 = \varepsilon$ (where this is the smallest such i) and $x_j\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon'$ (where this is the smallest such j).

   $$\mathsf{if}\psi_1 \longmapsto \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1; T\psi_1, F\psi_1)$$
   $$\mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(N_j^{\varepsilon'}\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2)$$

   The induction hypothesis tells us this lemma holds for all aspects of $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1$; therefore Lemma 36 applies, yielding $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1; T\psi_1, F\psi_1) \in A[N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle/a]\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$, and thus $I_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2)$. But by applying the induction hypothesis and Lemma 36 to $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'}\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ we have

   $$\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle/a]\psi_1\psi_2}$$
   $$\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(N_j^{\varepsilon'}\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2).$$

   It remains only to show that $A[N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle/a]\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A[V/a]\psi_1\psi_2$, which follows from $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq V\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ by the third Kan condition of bool.

   (b) All $x_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 = r'\psi_1$, and $x_i\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ (where this is the smallest such i).

   This is similar to the previous case. We have $\mathsf{if}\psi_1 \longmapsto \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M\psi_1; \dots)$ and $\mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2; \dots)$. By the induction hypothesis and Lemma 36 on $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, we have $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M\psi_1; \dots) \in A[M/a]\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$ and therefore $I_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[M/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M\psi_1\psi_2; \dots)$. On the other hand, by $M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ we have $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M\psi_1\psi_2; \dots) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[M/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2; \dots)$. The result follows from $M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq V\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ by the second Kan condition of bool.

   (c) All $x_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 = r'\psi_1$, and all $x_i\psi_1\psi_2$ are dimension names.

   We have $\mathsf{if}\psi_1 \longmapsto \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M\psi_1; \dots)$ and $\mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M\psi_1\psi_2; \dots)$. By the induction hypothesis and Lemma 36 on $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, we have $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M\psi_1; \dots) \in A[M/a]\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$ and therefore $I_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[M/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M\psi_1\psi_2; \dots)$. The result follows from $M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq V\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ by the second Kan condition of bool.

(d) All $x_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 \neq r'\psi_1$, and $x_i\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ (where this is the smallest such i).

$$\mathsf{if}\psi_1 \longmapsto \mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{x_i\psi_1}}_{z.A\psi_1[H/a]}(r\psi_1 \rightsquigarrow r'\psi_1, \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M\psi_1; T\psi_1, F\psi_1); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1; T\psi_1, F\psi_1)})$$
$$\mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2; T\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2)$$

where $H := \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i\psi_1}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r\psi_1 \rightsquigarrow z, M\psi_1; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1})$. We start by showing

$$\mathsf{com} \in A[\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})/a]\psi_1\ [\Psi_1].$$

Since $A\psi_1[H/a]\langle r'\psi_1/z\rangle = A[\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})/a]\psi_1 = A[V/a]\psi_1$ (by the definition of H, and $z \# A$), this follows from Theorem 35 so long as:

i. $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M\psi_1; \dots) \in A\psi_1[H\langle r\psi_1/z\rangle/a]\ [\Psi_1]$,
ii. $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1; \dots) \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(N_j^{\varepsilon'}\psi_1; \dots) \in A\psi_1[H\langle y/z\rangle/a]\ [\Psi_1, y \mid x_i\psi_1 = \varepsilon, x_j\psi_1 = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
iii. $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi_1; \dots) \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1}(M\psi_1; \dots) \in A\psi_1[H\langle r\psi_1/z\rangle/a]\ [\Psi_1 \mid x_i\psi_1 = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε.

All three follow from the induction hypothesis and Lemma 36 applied to the appropriate equality judgments, using the Kan conditions of bool to adjust the types: by the second Kan condition, $H\langle r\psi_1/z\rangle \doteq M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$, and by the third Kan condition of bool, $H\langle y/z\rangle \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1, y \mid x_i\psi_1 = \varepsilon]$.

From this we conclude $\mathsf{com} \Downarrow I_1$ and $I_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[V/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{com}\psi_2$. However, since $x_i\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$, by Theorem 35, $\mathsf{com}\psi_2 \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2; \dots) \in A[V/a]\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$. But the right-hand side is what $\mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2$ steps to, so $I_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[V/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2$ follows.

(e) All $x_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 \neq r'\psi_1$, all $x_i\psi_1\psi_2$ are dimension names, and $r\psi_1\psi_2 = r'\psi_1\psi_2$.

We have $\mathsf{if}\psi_1 \longmapsto \mathsf{com}$ as in the previous case, and $\mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M\psi_1\psi_2; \dots)$. As before, $\mathsf{com} \in A[V/a]\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$, so $\mathsf{com} \Downarrow I_1$ and $I_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[V/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{com}\psi_2$. Since $r\psi_1\psi_2 = r'\psi_1\psi_2$, by Theorem 35, $\mathsf{com}\psi_2 \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M\psi_1\psi_2; \dots) \in A[V/a]\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$. Thus $\mathsf{com}\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[V/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi_1\psi_2}(M\psi_1\psi_2; \dots)$, and the result follows by transitivity.

(f) All $x_i\psi_1$ are dimension names, $r\psi_1 \neq r'\psi_1$, all $x_i\psi_1\psi_2$ are dimension names, and $r\psi_1\psi_2 \neq r'\psi_1\psi_2$.

We have $\mathsf{if}\psi_1 \longmapsto \mathsf{com}$ as in the previous cases, and $\mathsf{if}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto \mathsf{com}\psi_2$. As before, $\mathsf{com} \in A[V/a]\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$, so $\mathsf{com} \Downarrow I_1$ and $I_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[V/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{com}\psi_2$, which is what we need to show. □

Since Lemma 37 holds for all $V \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} V'$, Lemma 36 holds for *any* $M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, and thus the elimination rule for booleans holds.

Computation If $a : \mathsf{bool} \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, $T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$, and $F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(\mathsf{true}; T, F) \doteq T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(\mathsf{false}; T, F) \doteq F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$.

For all ψ, $\mathsf{if}_{a.A\psi}(\mathsf{true}; T\psi, F\psi) \longmapsto T\psi$, so the former follows by Lemma 24 and $T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$. The latter case is analogous.

4.2 Circle

Our definition of $\mathbb{S}^1$ is very similar to that of bool, because we defined bool as a higher inductive type (with no path constructors). A cubical type system *has the circle* if $\mathbb{S}^1 \approx^{\Psi} \mathbb{S}^1$ for all Ψ, and $- \approx^{-}_{\mathbb{S}^1} -$ is the least relation such that:

1. $\mathsf{base} \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{base}$,
2. $\mathsf{loop}_x \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{loop}_x$, and
3. $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N^{\varepsilon}_i}) \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P^{\varepsilon}_i})$ whenever $r \neq r'$,
   (a) $M \doteq O \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]$,
   (b) $N^{\varepsilon}_i \doteq N^{\varepsilon'}_j \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon, x_j = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
   (c) $N^{\varepsilon}_i \doteq P^{\varepsilon}_i \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε, and
   (d) $N^{\varepsilon}_i\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi \mid x_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε.

We proceed by proving theorems about cubical type systems that have the circle. We will omit the many proofs that are identical to those in the previous subsection.

Pretype $\mathbb{S}^1\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$.
For all ψ_1, ψ_2, $\mathbb{S}^1\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathbb{S}^1$, $\mathbb{S}^1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathbb{S}^1$, $\mathbb{S}^1\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathbb{S}^1$, and $\mathbb{S}^1 \approx^{\Psi_2} \mathbb{S}^1$.

Introduction $\mathsf{base} \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]$, $\mathsf{loop}_r \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]$, and $\mathsf{loop}_{\varepsilon} \doteq \mathsf{base} \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]$.

1. For all $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, $\mathsf{base}\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{base}$, $\mathsf{base}\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{base}$, $\mathsf{base}\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{base}$, and $\mathsf{base} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{base}$.
2. For all $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, we case on $r\psi_1$ and $r\psi_1\psi_2$:
   (a) $r\psi_1 = \varepsilon$. (Therefore $r\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ also.)
   Then $\mathsf{loop}_{r\psi_1} \Downarrow \mathsf{base}$, $\mathsf{base}\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{base}$, $\mathsf{loop}_{r\psi_1\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{base}$, and $\mathsf{base} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{base}$.
   (b) $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = \varepsilon$.
   Then $\mathsf{loop}_{r\psi_1} \Downarrow \mathsf{loop}_x$, $\mathsf{loop}_{x\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{base}$, $\mathsf{loop}_{r\psi_1\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{base}$, and $\mathsf{base} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{base}$.
   (c) $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = x'$.
   Then $\mathsf{loop}_{r\psi_1} \Downarrow \mathsf{loop}_x$, $\mathsf{loop}_{x\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{loop}_{x'}$, $\mathsf{loop}_{r\psi_1\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{loop}_{x'}$, and $\mathsf{loop}_{x'} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{loop}_{x'}$.
3. By head expansion and the first introduction rule, since for all ψ, $\mathsf{loop}_{\varepsilon\psi} \longmapsto \mathsf{base}\psi$.

Kan $\mathbb{S}^1\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ is Kan.
This proof is identical to the proof that $\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ is Kan, because the relevant portions of the operational semantics and the definition of $- \approx^{-}_{\mathbb{S}^1} -$ are identical.

Cubical For any Ψ' and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathbb{S}^1} N$, $M \doteq N \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi']$.
There are three cases in which $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathbb{S}^1} N$. For base and loop_x, this follows from the introduction rules already proven. For $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N^{\varepsilon}_i}) \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P^{\varepsilon}_i})$, this follows from the first Kan condition of $\mathbb{S}^1$, again already proven.

Elimination If $M \doteq M' \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]$, $a : \mathbb{S}^1 \gg A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, $P \doteq P' \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$, $L \doteq L' \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x]$, and $L\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$ for all ε, then $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(M; P, x.L) \doteq \mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A'}(M'; P', x.L') \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]$.

We prove the elimination rule using the same strategy as our proof of the elimination rule for booleans; see Lemmas 36 and 37 for full details.

Lemma 38. *If*

1. $M \doteq M' \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]$ *such that for any* $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ *and* $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$*, the elimination rule holds for any pair of the aspects* $M_2, M_{12}, M_2', M_{12}'$ *of* M, M'*,*
2. $a : \mathbb{S}^1 \gg A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$*,*
3. $P \doteq P' \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$*,*
4. $L \doteq L' \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x]$*, and*
5. $L\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$ *for all* ε*,*

then $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(M; P, x.L) \doteq \mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A'}(M'; P', x.L') \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]$.

Proof. Same proof as Lemma 36. □

Lemma 39. *If* $V \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathbb{S}^1} V'$*, then for any* $a : \mathbb{S}^1 \gg A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$*,* $P \doteq P' \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$*, and* $L \doteq L' \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x]$*, such that* $L\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$ *for all* ε*,* $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(V; P, x.L) \doteq \mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A'}(V'; P', x.L') \in A[V/a]\ [\Psi]$.

Proof. By induction on $V \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathbb{S}^1} V'$.

1. $\mathsf{base} \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{base}$.

   For all ψ, $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A\psi}(\mathsf{base}; P\psi, x.L\psi) \longmapsto P\psi$ and $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A'\psi}(\mathsf{base}; P'\psi, x.L'\psi) \longmapsto P'\psi$. Thus by Lemma 24 on both sides, the result follows from $P \doteq P' \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$, which we have assumed.

2. $\mathsf{loop}_y \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{loop}_y$.

   We focus on the unary case, showing that for all $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}\psi_1 \Downarrow E_1$ and $E_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[\mathsf{loop}_y/a]\psi_1\psi_2} \mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}\psi_1\psi_2$. We case-analyze y under ψ_1 and $\psi_1\psi_2$:

   (a) $y\psi_1 = \varepsilon$.
   Then $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}\psi_1 \longmapsto^* P\psi_1$ and $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* P\psi_1\psi_2$. By $P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$, $P\psi_1 \Downarrow P_1$ and $P_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[\mathsf{base}/a]\psi_1\psi_2} P\psi_1\psi_2$. The result follows by $A[\mathsf{base}/a]\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A[\mathsf{loop}_y/a]\psi_1\psi_2$ because $y\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ and $\mathsf{base} \doteq \mathsf{loop}_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi_2]$.

   (b) $y\psi_1 = y'$ and $y\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$.
   Then $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}\psi_1 \longmapsto^* L\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle$ and $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* P\psi_1\psi_2$. By $L \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x]$, $L\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle \Downarrow L_1$ and $L_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[\mathsf{loop}_\varepsilon/a]\psi_1\psi_2} L\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle\psi_2 = L\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\psi_1\psi_2$, since $x \# A$ and $x\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle\psi_2 = \varepsilon$. By $L\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$, we also have $L\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[\mathsf{base}/a]\psi_1\psi_2} P\psi_1\psi_2$. The result follows by transitivity and $A[\mathsf{base}/a]\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A[\mathsf{loop}_\varepsilon/a]\psi_1\psi_2$.

(c) $y\psi_1 = y'$ and $y\psi_1\psi_2 = y''$.
Then $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}\psi_1 \longmapsto^* L\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle$ and $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* L\psi_1\psi_2\langle y''/x\rangle = L\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle\psi_2$. By $L \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x]$, $L\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle \Downarrow L_1$ and $L_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle\psi_2} L\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle\psi_2$. The result follows by $x\psi_1\langle y'/x\rangle\psi_2 = y\psi_1\psi_2$ and $x \# A$.

3. $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \approx^\Psi_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathbb{S}^1}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon})$, such that $r \neq r'$, $M \doteq O \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon, x_j = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε, and $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi \mid x_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε.

This case proceeds identically to the hcom case in Lemma 37, and appeals to Lemma 38. □

Since Lemma 39 holds for all $V \approx^\Psi_{\mathbb{S}^1} V'$, Lemma 38 holds for *any* $M \doteq M' \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]$, and thus the elimination rule for the circle holds.

Computation If $a : \mathbb{S}^1 \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, $P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$, $L \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x]$, and $L\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$ for all ε, then $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(\mathsf{base}; P, x.L) \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$ and $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(\mathsf{loop}_r; P, x.L) \doteq L\langle r/x\rangle \in A[\mathsf{loop}_r/a]\ [\Psi]$.

For all ψ, $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A\psi}(\mathsf{base}; P\psi, x.L\psi) \longmapsto P\psi$, so the first computation rule follows by Lemma 24 and $P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$.

For the second computation rule, we know that both sides are $- \in A[\mathsf{loop}_r/a]\ [\Psi]$, so by Lemma 25, it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A\psi}(\mathsf{loop}_{r\psi}; P\psi, x.L\psi) \sim^{\Psi'}_{A[\mathsf{loop}_r/a]\psi} L\langle r/x\rangle\psi$. There are two cases:

1. $r\psi = \varepsilon$.
Then $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A\psi}(\mathsf{loop}_{r\psi}; P\psi, x.L\psi) \longmapsto \mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A\psi}(\mathsf{base}; P\psi, x.L\psi) \longmapsto P\psi$ and we must show $P\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{A[\mathsf{loop}_r/a]\psi} L\langle r/x\rangle\psi$. Since $r\psi = \varepsilon$, and $A\psi[\mathsf{loop}_\varepsilon/a] \sim^{\Psi'} A\psi[\mathsf{base}/a]$, this is equivalently $P\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{A[\mathsf{base}/a]\psi} L\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\psi$, which we know by $L\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]$.

2. $r\psi = w$.
Then $\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A\psi}(\mathsf{loop}_{r\psi}; P\psi, x.L\psi) \longmapsto L\psi\langle w/x\rangle = L\langle r/x\rangle\psi$, and it suffices to show that $L\langle r/x\rangle\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{A[\mathsf{loop}_r/a]\psi} L\langle r/x\rangle\psi$, which we know by $L \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x]$.

4.3 Dependent functions

If a cubical type system has $A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$ and $a : A \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, we say it *has their dependent function type* when for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $(a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi \approx^{\Psi'} (a{:}A'\psi) \to B'\psi$, and $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\to B\psi} -$ is the least relation such that

$$\lambda a.M \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\to B\psi} \lambda a.M'$$

when $a : A\psi \gg M \doteq M' \in B\psi\ [\Psi']$.

In any cubical type system where $(a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi \approx^{\Psi'} (a{:}A'\psi) \to B'\psi$, the PERs $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\to B\psi} -$ and $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A'\psi)\to B'\psi} -$ must be equal. This is true because $a : A\psi \gg M \doteq M' \in B\psi\ [\Psi']$ if and only if $a : A'\psi \gg M \doteq M' \in B'\psi\ [\Psi']$.

In the remainder of this subsection, we assume we are working with a cubical type system that has $A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, $a : A \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, and their dependent function type.

Pretype $(a{:}A) \to B \doteq (a{:}A') \to B'$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$.

For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, $(a{:}A\psi_1) \to B\psi_1$ val $[\Psi_1]$ and $(a{:}A\psi_1\psi_2) \to B\psi_1\psi_2$ val $[\Psi_2]$. Then $(a{:}A\psi_1\psi_2) \to B\psi_1\psi_2 \approx^{\Psi_2} (a{:}A'\psi_1\psi_2) \to B'\psi_1\psi_2$, which follows by our assumption that the cubical type system has this dependent function type.

Introduction If $a : A \gg M \doteq M' \in B\ [\Psi]$ then $\lambda a.M \doteq \lambda a.M' \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]$.

Each side has coherent aspects up to syntactic equality, since $\lambda a.M\psi$ val $[\Psi']$ for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$. Thus it suffices to show $\lambda a.M\psi_1\psi_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{(a:A\psi_1\psi_2)\to B\psi_1\psi_2} \lambda a.M'\psi_1\psi_2$, which is true because $a : A\psi_1\psi_2 \gg M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq M'\psi_1\psi_2 \in B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$.

Elimination If $M \doteq M' \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]$ and $N \doteq N' \in A\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{app}(M, N) \doteq \mathsf{app}(M', N') \in B[N/a]\ [\Psi]$.

For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, by $M \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]$ we know $M\psi_1 \Downarrow \lambda a.O_1$ and $a : A\psi_1 \gg O_1 \in B\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$. Thus

$$\mathsf{app}(M\psi_1, N\psi_1) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{app}(\lambda a.O_1, N\psi_1) \longmapsto O_1[N\psi_1/a]$$

and since $N\psi_1 \in A\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$, we know $O_1[N\psi_1/a] \in B[N/a]\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$ and thus $O_1[N\psi_1/a] \Downarrow X_1$ and $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{B[N/a]\psi_1\psi_2} O_1\psi_2[N\psi_1\psi_2/a]$.

We also know $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \lambda a.O_{12} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{(a:A\psi_1\psi_2)\to B\psi_1\psi_2} \lambda a.O_1\psi_2$ so $a : A\psi_1\psi_2 \gg O_1\psi_2 \doteq O_{12} \in B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$. Thus

$$\mathsf{app}(M\psi_1\psi_2, N\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{app}(\lambda a.O_{12}, N\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto O_{12}[N\psi_1\psi_2/a]$$

and $O_1\psi_2[N\psi_1\psi_2/a] \doteq O_{12}[N\psi_1\psi_2/a] \in B[N/a]\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$. This implies $O_1\psi_2[N\psi_1\psi_2/a] \sim^{\Psi_2}_{B[N/a]\psi_1\psi_2} O_{12}[N\psi_1\psi_2/a]$, so $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{B[N/a]\psi_1\psi_2} O_{12}[N\psi_1\psi_2/a]$ follows by transitivity.

An analogous argument shows $\mathsf{app}(M', N')$ also has coherent aspects. To see that the aspects of $\mathsf{app}(M, N)$ and $\mathsf{app}(M', N')$ are related to each other, we use the fact that $M'\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \lambda a.O'_{12}$ and $a : A\psi_1\psi_2 \gg O_{12} \doteq O'_{12} \in B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$, so $\mathsf{app}(M'\psi_1\psi_2, N'\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* O'_{12}[N'\psi_1\psi_2/a]$ and $O_{12}[N\psi_1\psi_2/a] \doteq O'_{12}[N'\psi_1\psi_2/a] \in B[N/a]\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$.

Computation If $a : A \gg M \in B\ [\Psi]$ and $N \in A\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{app}(\lambda a.M, N) \doteq M[N/a] \in B[N/a]\ [\Psi]$.

That $M[N/a] \in B[N/a]\ [\Psi]$ follows from the definition of $a : A \gg M \in B\ [\Psi]$, and the result follows by Lemma 24.

Eta If $M \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]$ then $M \doteq \lambda a.\mathsf{app}(M, a) \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]$.

We start by proving $\lambda a.\mathsf{app}(M, a) \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]$. By the introduction rule for dependent functions, it suffices to show $a : A \gg \mathsf{app}(M, a) \in B\ [\Psi]$, which holds when for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and $N \doteq N' \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$, $\mathsf{app}(M\psi, N) \doteq \mathsf{app}(M\psi, N') \in B\psi[N/a]\ [\Psi']$. This follows from the elimination rule and $M\psi \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']$.

The eta rule will now follow from Lemma 25 once we show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\to B\psi} \lambda a.\mathsf{app}(M\psi, a)$. Since $M\psi \Downarrow \lambda a.O$, this follows when $a : A\psi \gg O \doteq \mathsf{app}(M\psi, a) \in B\psi\ [\Psi']$, that is, when for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$ and $N \doteq N' \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$, $O\psi'[N/a] \doteq \mathsf{app}(M\psi\psi', N') \in B\psi\psi'[N/a]\ [\Psi'']$.

Both sides have this type (because $a : A\psi \gg O \in B\psi\ [\Psi']$), so by Lemma 25 it suffices to show that for any $\psi'' : \Psi''' \to \Psi''$, $O\psi'\psi''[N\psi''/a] \sim^{\Psi'''}_{B\psi\psi'[N/a]\psi''} \mathsf{app}(M\psi\psi'\psi'', N'\psi'')$. By $M \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]$, $M\psi\psi'\psi'' \Downarrow \lambda a.O''$ and $a : A\psi\psi'\psi'' \gg O\psi'\psi'' \doteq O'' \in B\psi\psi'\psi''\ [\Psi''']$. Thus $\mathsf{app}(M\psi\psi'\psi'', N'\psi'') \longmapsto^* \mathsf{app}(\lambda a.O'', N'\psi'') \longmapsto O''[N'\psi''/a]$, and $O\psi'\psi''[N\psi''/a] \sim^{\Psi'''}_{B\psi\psi'[N/a]\psi''} O''[N'\psi''/a]$.

Kan $(a{:}A) \to B \doteq (a{:}A') \to B'\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ are equally Kan.

For the first Kan condition, we must show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if

1. $M \doteq O \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
3. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, and
4. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{(a:A\psi)\to B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{(a:A'\psi)\to B'\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon}) \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 24 on both sides, it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda a.\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{app}(M, a); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon, a)})\\ \doteq\ &\lambda a.\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{B'\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{app}(O, a); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{app}(P_i^\varepsilon, a)}) \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']\end{aligned}$$

By the introduction rule for dependent functions, it suffices to show the bodies of these lambdas are $a : A\psi \gg - \doteq - \in B\psi\ [\Psi']$. That is, for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$ and $Q \doteq Q' \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{B\psi\psi'[Q/a]}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', \mathsf{app}(M\psi', Q); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi', Q)})\\ \doteq\ &\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{B'\psi\psi'[Q'/a]}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', \mathsf{app}(O\psi', Q'); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{app}(P_i^\varepsilon\psi', Q')}) \in B\psi\psi'[Q/a]\ [\Psi'']\end{aligned}$$

Since $a : A \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, we know $B\psi\psi'[Q/a] \doteq B'\psi\psi'[Q'/a]\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$ so these types are equally Kan, and thus the above hcoms are equal so long as:

1. $\mathsf{app}(M\psi', Q) \doteq \mathsf{app}(O\psi', Q') \in B\psi\psi'[Q/a]\ [\Psi'']$,
2. $\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi', Q) \doteq \mathsf{app}(N_j^{\varepsilon'}\psi', Q) \in B\psi\psi'[Q/a]\ [\Psi'', y \mid r_i\psi' = \varepsilon, r_j\psi' = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
3. $\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi', Q) \doteq \mathsf{app}(P_i^\varepsilon\psi', Q') \in B\psi\psi'[Q/a]\ [\Psi'', y \mid r_i\psi' = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, and
4. $\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle\psi', Q) \doteq \mathsf{app}(M\psi', Q) \in B\psi\psi'[Q/a]\ [\Psi'' \mid r_i\psi' = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε (since $y \# Q$).

These follow from our hypotheses and the elimination rule for dependent functions; the context-restricted judgments follow from the fact that dimension substitutions push into the subterms of $\mathsf{app}(-,-)$. For example, $\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi', Q) \doteq \mathsf{app}(P_i^\varepsilon\psi', Q') \in B\psi\psi'[Q/a]\ [\Psi'', y \mid r_i\psi' = \varepsilon]$ means that for any $\psi'' : \Psi''' \to (\Psi'', y)$ such that $r_i\psi'\psi'' = \varepsilon$, $\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi'\psi'', Q\psi'') \doteq \mathsf{app}(P_i^\varepsilon\psi'\psi'', Q'\psi'') \in B\psi\psi'[Q/a]\psi''\ [\Psi''']$. We know that $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ and $\psi'\psi''$ satisfies $r_i = \varepsilon$, so $N_i^\varepsilon\psi'\psi'' \doteq P_i^\varepsilon\psi'\psi'' \in (a{:}A\psi\psi'\psi'') \to B\psi\psi'\psi''\ [\Psi''']$, $Q\psi'' \doteq Q'\psi'' \in A\psi\psi'\psi''\ [\Psi''']$, and the elimination rule applies.

The second Kan condition requires that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if

1. $M \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{(a:A\psi)\to B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 24, it suffices to show

$$\lambda a.\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, \mathsf{app}(M, a); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon, a)}) \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']$$

By the eta and introduction rules for dependent functions, it suffices to show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$ and $O \doteq O' \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$,

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{B\psi\psi'[O/a]}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r\psi', \mathsf{app}(M\psi', O); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi', O)}) \doteq \mathsf{app}(M\psi', O') \in B\psi[O/a]\ [\Psi'']$$

We apply the second Kan condition of $B\psi\psi'[O/a]\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$, deriving its hypotheses from the elimination rule for dependent functions, as in the previous case. We conclude the above hcom is equal to $\mathsf{app}(M\psi', O)$, which is equal to $\mathsf{app}(M\psi', O')$ again by the elimination rule.

The third Kan condition asserts that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if $r_i = \varepsilon$ for some i,

1. $M \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{(a:A\psi)\to B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']$.

As in the previous case, by Lemma 24 and the eta and introduction rules for dependent functions, it suffices to show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$ and $O \doteq O' \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$,

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{B\psi\psi'[O/a]}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', \mathsf{app}(M\psi', O); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi', O)}) \doteq \mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi', O') \in B\psi[O/a]\ [\Psi'']$$

By the third Kan condition of $B\psi\psi'[O/a]\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$ and the elimination rule, the above hcom is equal to $\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi', O)$, which is equal to $\mathsf{app}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi', O')$ by the elimination rule.

The fourth Kan condition asserts that for any $\psi : (\Psi', x) \to \Psi$, if

$$M \doteq M' \in (a{:}A\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \to B\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$$

then

$$\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.(a:A\psi)\to B\psi}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.(a:A'\psi)\to B'\psi}(M') \in (a{:}A\psi\langle r'/x\rangle) \to B\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\ [\Psi'].$$

By Lemma 24 on both sides and the introduction rule for dependent functions, it suffices to show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$ and $N \doteq N' \in A\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle\ [\Psi'']$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{x.B\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi'\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N)/a]}(\mathsf{app}(M\psi', \mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi'\rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N)))\\ \doteq\ &\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{x.B'\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi'\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A'\psi\psi'}(N')/a]}(\mathsf{app}(M'\psi', \mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi'\rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x.A'\psi\psi'}(N'))) \in B\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle[N/a]\ [\Psi''].\end{aligned}$$

By the fourth Kan condition of $A \doteq A'$ type $[\Psi]$, $\mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A'\psi\psi'}(N') \in A\psi\psi'$ $[\Psi'', x]$, so $B\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N)/a] \doteq B'\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A'\psi\psi'}(N')/a]$ type $[\Psi'', x]$. By the fourth Kan condition of these types and of $A \doteq A'$ type $[\Psi]$, and the elimination rule for dependent functions, the coe of interest above are $- \doteq - \in B\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N)/a]\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle$ $[\Psi'']$. By the fifth Kan condition of $A \doteq A'$ type $[\Psi]$, $\mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N) \doteq N \in A\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle$ $[\Psi'']$, so $B\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r'\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N)/a]\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle \doteq B\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle[N/a]$ type $[\Psi'']$ and the result follows.

The fifth Kan condition asserts that for any $\psi : (\Psi', x) \to \Psi$, if $M \in (a{:}A\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \to B\psi\langle r/x\rangle$ $[\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r}_{x.(a:A\psi)\to B\psi}(M) \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \to B\psi\langle r/x\rangle$ $[\Psi']$.

By Lemma 24 and the eta and introduction rules for dependent functions, it suffices to show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$ and $N \doteq N' \in A\psi\psi'\langle r\psi'/x\rangle$ $[\Psi'']$,

$$\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x.B\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N)/a]}(\mathsf{app}(M\psi', \mathsf{coe}^{r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N))) \doteq \mathsf{app}(M\psi', N') \in B\psi\psi'\langle r\psi'/x\rangle[N/a]\ [\Psi''].$$

As above, by the fourth Kan condition of $A \doteq A'$ type $[\Psi]$, $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N) \in A\psi\psi'$ $[\Psi'', x]$, so $B\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N)/a]$ type $[\Psi'', x]$. By the fifth Kan condition of $A \doteq A'$ type $[\Psi]$ and transitivity of $\doteq$, $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N) \doteq N' \in A\psi\psi'\langle r\psi'/x\rangle$ $[\Psi'']$. Then by the fifth Kan condition of $B\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N)/a]$ type $[\Psi'', x]$ and the elimination rule for dependent functions, the coe on the left-hand side above is $- \doteq \mathsf{app}(M\psi', N') \in B\psi\psi'[\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi' \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(N)/a]\langle r\psi'/x\rangle$ $[\Psi'']$, and this type is again equal to $B\psi\psi'\langle r\psi'/x\rangle[N/a]$ so the result follows.

Cubical For any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\to B\psi} M'$, we have $M \doteq M' \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi$ $[\Psi']$.

Then $M = \lambda a.N$, $M' = \lambda a.N'$, and $a : A\psi \gg N \doteq N' \in B\psi$ $[\Psi']$, and the result follows from the introduction rule for functions.

4.4 Dependent pairs

If a cubical type system has $A \doteq A'$ type $[\Psi]$ and $a : A \gg B \doteq B'$ type $[\Psi]$, we say it *has their dependent pair type* when for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $(a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi \approx^{\Psi'} (a{:}A'\psi) \times B'\psi$, and $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\times B\psi} -$ is the least relation such that

$$\langle M, N\rangle \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\times B\psi} \langle M', N'\rangle$$

when $M \doteq M' \in A\psi$ $[\Psi']$ and $N \doteq N' \in B\psi[M/a]$ $[\Psi']$.

This relation is symmetric because $B\psi[M/a] \doteq B\psi[M'/a]$ type $[\Psi']$, so $N' \doteq N \in B\psi[M'/a]$ $[\Psi']$. The PERs $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\times B\psi} -$ and $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A'\psi)\times B'\psi} -$ are equal because $M \doteq M' \in A\psi$ $[\Psi']$ if and only if $M \doteq M' \in A'\psi$ $[\Psi']$, and $N \doteq N' \in B\psi[M/a]$ $[\Psi']$ if and only if $N \doteq N' \in B'\psi[M/a]$ $[\Psi']$.

In the remainder of this subsection, we assume we are working with a cubical type system that has $A \doteq A'$ type $[\Psi]$, $a : A \gg B \doteq B'$ type $[\Psi]$, and their dependent pair type.

Pretype $(a{:}A) \times B \doteq (a{:}A') \times B'$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$.

For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, $(a{:}A\psi_1\psi_2) \times B\psi_1\psi_2 \approx^{\Psi_2} (a{:}A'\psi_1\psi_2) \times B'\psi_1\psi_2$ because the cubical type system has this dependent pair type.

Introduction If $M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi]$ and $N \doteq N' \in B[M/a]\ [\Psi]$, then $\langle M, N\rangle \doteq \langle M', N'\rangle \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]$.

Each side has coherent aspects up to syntactic equality, since $\langle M\psi, N\psi\rangle\ \mathsf{val}\ [\Psi']$ for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$. Thus it suffices to show $\langle M\psi_1\psi_2, N\psi_1\psi_2\rangle \approx^{\Psi_2}_{(a:A\psi_1\psi_2)\times B\psi_1\psi_2} \langle M'\psi_1\psi_2, N'\psi_1\psi_2\rangle$, which is true because $M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq M'\psi_1\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$ and $N\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq N'\psi_1\psi_2 \in B\psi_1\psi_2[M\psi_1\psi_2/a]\ [\Psi_2]$.

Elimination If $M \doteq M' \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{fst}(M) \doteq \mathsf{fst}(M') \in A\ [\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{snd}(M) \doteq \mathsf{snd}(M') \in B[\mathsf{fst}(M)/a]\ [\Psi]$.

For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, we know $M\psi_1 \Downarrow \langle O_1, P_1\rangle$ where $O_1 \in A\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$ and $P_1 \in B\psi_1[O_1/a]\ [\Psi_1]$. Thus $\mathsf{fst}(M\psi_1) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{fst}(\langle O_1, P_1\rangle) \longmapsto O_1$ where $O_1 \Downarrow X_1$ and $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} O_1\psi_2$. We also know $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \langle O_{12}, P_{12}\rangle \approx^{\Psi_2}_{(a:A\psi_1\psi_2)\times B\psi_1\psi_2} \langle O_1\psi_2, P_1\psi_2\rangle$, so $O_{12} \doteq O_1\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$ and $P_{12} \doteq P_1\psi_2 \in B\psi_1\psi_2[O_{12}/a]\ [\Psi_2]$. Thus $\mathsf{fst}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{fst}(\langle O_{12}, P_{12}\rangle) \longmapsto O_{12}$. We want to show $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} O_{12}$, which follows from $O_{12} \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} O_1\psi_2$ and transitivity.

An analogous argument shows $\mathsf{fst}(M')$ also has coherent aspects. To see that the aspects of $\mathsf{fst}(M)$ and $\mathsf{fst}(M')$ are related to each other, we use the fact that $M'\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \langle O'_{12}, P'_{12}\rangle$ and $O_{12} \doteq O'_{12} \in A\psi_1\ [\Psi_2]$, so $\mathsf{fst}(M'\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* O'_{12}$ and $O_{12} \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} O'_{12}$.

For the second elimination rule, $\mathsf{snd}(M\psi_1) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{snd}(\langle O_1, P_1\rangle) \longmapsto P_1$ where $P_1 \Downarrow Y_1$ and $Y_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{B\psi_1\psi_2[O_1\psi_2/a]} P_1\psi_2$; and $\mathsf{snd}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{snd}(\langle O_{12}, P_{12}\rangle) \longmapsto P_{12}$. We want to show $Y_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{B\psi_1\psi_2[\mathsf{fst}(M\psi_1\psi_2)/a]} P_{12}$, which follows from $P_{12} \sim^{\Psi_2}_{B\psi_1\psi_2[O_{12}/a]} P_1\psi_2$ and transitivity once we show $B\psi_1\psi_2[O_{12}/a] \sim^{\Psi_2} B\psi_1\psi_2[O_1\psi_2/a]$ and $B\psi_1\psi_2[O_{12}/a] \sim^{\Psi_2} B\psi_1\psi_2[\mathsf{fst}(M\psi_1\psi_2)/a]$.

The former holds by $O_{12} \doteq O_1\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$, and the latter holds by $O_{12} \doteq \mathsf{fst}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$, which follows from Lemma 25 because both sides are $- \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$ (using the first elimination rule) and for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi_2$, $O_{12}\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{A\psi_1\psi_2\psi} \mathsf{fst}(M\psi_1\psi_2\psi)$ (since $\mathsf{fst}(M\psi_1\psi_2\psi) \longmapsto^* O$ where $O_{12}\psi \doteq O \in A\psi_1\psi_2\psi\ [\Psi']$). The aspects of $\mathsf{snd}(M')$ are coherent and related to those of $\mathsf{snd}(M)$ by the same argument as for $\mathsf{fst}(-)$.

Computation If $M \in A\ [\Psi]$ and $N \in B[M/a]\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{fst}(\langle M, N\rangle) \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{snd}(\langle M, N\rangle) \doteq N \in B[M/a]\ [\Psi]$.

Both follow from Lemma 24.

Eta If $M \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]$, then $M \doteq \langle \mathsf{fst}(M), \mathsf{snd}(M)\rangle \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]$.

The elimination and introduction rules for dependent pairs imply that $\langle \mathsf{fst}(M), \mathsf{snd}(M)\rangle \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]$. Thus by Lemma 25 it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\times B\psi} \langle \mathsf{fst}(M\psi), \mathsf{snd}(M\psi)\rangle$. Since $M\psi \Downarrow \langle O, P\rangle$, this follows when $O \doteq \mathsf{fst}(M\psi) \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$ and $P \doteq \mathsf{snd}(M\psi) \in B\psi[O/a]\ [\Psi']$.

To show the former, we apply Lemma 25 and show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, $O\psi' \sim^{\Psi''}_{A\psi\psi'} \mathsf{fst}(M\psi\psi')$. By $M \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]$, $M\psi\psi' \Downarrow \langle O', P'\rangle$ where $O' \doteq O\psi' \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$ and $P' \doteq P\psi' \in B\psi\psi'[O'/a]\ [\Psi'']$. Thus $\mathsf{fst}(M\psi\psi') \longmapsto^* \mathsf{fst}(\langle O', P'\rangle) \longmapsto O'$ and $O' \sim^{\Psi''}_{A\psi\psi'} O\psi'$.

To show the latter, we apply Lemma 25 and show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, $P\psi' \sim^{\Psi''}_{B\psi\psi'[O\psi'/a]} \mathsf{snd}(M\psi\psi')$. But $\mathsf{snd}(M\psi\psi') \longmapsto^* \mathsf{snd}(\langle O', P'\rangle) \longmapsto P'$ and $P' \sim^{\Psi''}_{B\psi\psi'[O'/a]} P\psi'$.

Kan $(a{:}A) \times B \doteq (a{:}A') \times B'\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ are equally Kan.

For the first Kan condition, we must show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if

1. $M \doteq O \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
3. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, and
4. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{(a:A\psi)\times B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{(a:A'\psi)\times B'\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon}) \in (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi\ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 24 on both sides, it suffices to show that

$$\langle \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)}), \mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{z.B\psi[F/a]}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{snd}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{snd}(N_i^\varepsilon)})\rangle$$
$$\doteq \langle \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A'\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{fst}(O); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(P_i^\varepsilon)}), \mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{z.B'\psi[F'/a]}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{snd}(O); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{snd}(P_i^\varepsilon)})\rangle \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi']$$

where

$$F = \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow z, \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)})$$
$$F' = \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A'\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow z, \mathsf{fst}(O); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(P_i^\varepsilon)})$$

By the introduction rule for dependent pairs, it suffices to show the first components are $- \doteq - \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$ and the second components are $- \doteq - \in B\psi[\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)})/a]\ [\Psi']$. The first components follow from the first Kan condition of $A\psi \doteq A'\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi']$ and the first elimination rule for dependent pairs (again, deriving the context-restricted judgments by pushing dimension substitutions into $\mathsf{fst}(-)$). For the same reason, $F \doteq F' \in A\psi\ [\Psi', z]$.

The second components follow from Theorem 35 and $B\psi[F/a] \doteq B'\psi[F'/a]\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi', z]$: it suffices to show

1. $\mathsf{snd}(M) \doteq \mathsf{snd}(O) \in B\psi[F\langle r/z\rangle/a]\ [\Psi']$,
2. $\mathsf{snd}(N_i^\varepsilon) \doteq \mathsf{snd}(N_j^{\varepsilon'}) \in B\psi[F\langle y/z\rangle/a]\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
3. $\mathsf{snd}(N_i^\varepsilon) \doteq \mathsf{snd}(P_i^\varepsilon) \in B\psi[F\langle y/z\rangle/a]\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, and
4. $\mathsf{snd}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle) \doteq \mathsf{snd}(M) \in B\psi[F\langle r/z\rangle/a]\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε.

because it implies $\mathsf{com} \doteq \mathsf{com} \in B\psi[F\langle r'/z\rangle/a]\ [\Psi']$, and $F\langle r'/z\rangle = \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)})$. These all follow from the second elimination rule for dependent pairs, $F\langle r/z\rangle \doteq \mathsf{fst}(M) \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$ (by the second Kan condition of $A\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi']$), and $F\langle y/z\rangle \doteq \mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon) \in A\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ (by the third Kan condition of $A\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi']$ and the definition of context restriction).

The second Kan condition requires that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if

1. $M \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{(a:A\psi)\times B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 24, it suffices to show

$$\langle \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)}), \mathsf{com}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{z.B\psi[F/a]}(r \rightsquigarrow r, \mathsf{snd}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{snd}(N_i^\varepsilon)})\rangle \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi\ [\Psi']$$

where $F = \overrightarrow{\mathsf{hcom}}^{r_i}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow z, \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)})$. By the eta and introduction rules for dependent pairs, it suffices to show that

$$\mathsf{fst}(M) \doteq \overrightarrow{\mathsf{hcom}}^{r_i}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)}) \in A\psi \ [\Psi']$$

which follows from the second Kan condition of $A\psi$ type $[\Psi']$, and

$$\mathsf{snd}(M) \doteq \overrightarrow{\mathsf{com}}^{r_i}_{z.B\psi[F/a]}(r \rightsquigarrow r, \mathsf{snd}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{snd}(N_i^\varepsilon)}) \in B\psi[\mathsf{fst}(M)/a] \ [\Psi']$$

which follows from Theorem 35, deriving its hypotheses from the second elimination rule for dependent pairs as in the previous case, and by $F\langle r/z\rangle \doteq \mathsf{fst}(M) \in A\psi \ [\Psi']$ (by the second Kan condition of $A\psi$ type $[\Psi']$).

The third Kan condition asserts that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if $r_i = \varepsilon$ for some i,

1. $M \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi \ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi \ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi \ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\overrightarrow{\mathsf{hcom}}^{r_i}_{(a:A\psi)\times B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi \ [\Psi']$.

As in the previous case, by Lemma 24, it suffices to show

$$\langle \overrightarrow{\mathsf{hcom}}^{r_i}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)}), \overrightarrow{\mathsf{com}}^{r_i}_{z.B\psi[F/a]}(r \rightsquigarrow r, \mathsf{snd}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{snd}(N_i^\varepsilon)})\rangle \doteq N_i^\varepsilon \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi \ [\Psi']$$

where $F = \overrightarrow{\mathsf{hcom}}^{r_i}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow z, \mathsf{fst}(M); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)})$. The first projection of that pair is equal to $\mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon)$ by the third Kan condition of $A\psi$ type $[\Psi']$, and the second projection is equal to $\mathsf{snd}(N_i^\varepsilon)$ by Theorem 35 and the fact that $F\langle r'/z\rangle \doteq \mathsf{fst}(N_i^\varepsilon) \in A\psi \ [\Psi']$ (by the third Kan condition of $A\psi$ type $[\Psi']$ and $r_i = \varepsilon$). The result follows by the eta and introduction rules for dependent pairs.

The fourth Kan condition asserts that for any $\psi : (\Psi', x) \to \Psi$, if

$$M \doteq M' \in (a{:}A\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \times B\psi\langle r/x\rangle \ [\Psi']$$

then

$$\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.(a:A\psi)\times B\psi}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.(a:A'\psi)\times B'\psi}(M') \in (a{:}A\psi\langle r'/x\rangle) \times B\psi\langle r'/x\rangle \ [\Psi'].$$

By Lemma 24 on both sides and the introduction rule for dependent pairs, it suffices to show

$$\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M)) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A'\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M')) \in A\psi \ [\Psi']$$

which holds by the fourth Kan condition of $A\psi \doteq A'\psi$ type $[\Psi', x]$, and

$$\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.B\psi[\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M))/a]}(\mathsf{snd}(M)) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.B'\psi[\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A'\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M'))/a]}(\mathsf{snd}(M')) \in B\psi[\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M))/a] \ [\Psi']$$

which holds by the fourth Kan condition of $B\psi[\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M))/a] \doteq B'\psi[\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M'))/a]$ type $[\Psi', x]$ (since $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M)) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A'\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M')) \in A\psi \ [\Psi', x]$) and $x \# B\psi$.

The fifth Kan condition asserts that for any $\psi : (\Psi', x) \to \Psi$, if $M \in (a{:}A\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \times B\psi\langle r/x\rangle \ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.(a:A\psi)\to B\psi}(M) \doteq M \in (a{:}A\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \times B\psi\langle r/x\rangle \ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 24 on both sides and the introduction rule for dependent pairs, it suffices to show

$$\mathsf{fst}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M)) \in A\psi \ [\Psi']$$

which holds by the fifth Kan condition of $A\psi \doteq A'\psi \ \mathsf{type} \ [\Psi', x]$, and

$$\mathsf{snd}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r}_{x.B\psi[\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M))/a]}(\mathsf{snd}(M)) \in B\psi[\mathsf{fst}(M)/a] \ [\Psi']$$

which holds by the fifth Kan condition of $B\psi[\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow x}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M))/a] \ \mathsf{type} \ [\Psi', x]$ and by the fact that $B\psi[\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{fst}(M))/a] \doteq B\psi[\mathsf{fst}(M)/a] \ \mathsf{type} \ [\Psi']$.

Cubical For any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{(a:A\psi)\times B\psi} M'$, we have $M \doteq M' \in (a{:}A\psi) \times B\psi \ [\Psi']$.

Then $M = \langle O, P\rangle$, $M' = \langle O', P'\rangle$, $O \doteq O' \in A\psi \ [\Psi']$ and $P \doteq P' \in B\psi[O/a] \ [\Psi']$, and the result follows from the introduction rule for dependent pairs.

4.5 Identification types

If a cubical type system has $A \doteq A' \ \mathsf{type} \ [\Psi, x]$, $P_0 \doteq P'_0 \in A\langle 0/x\rangle \ [\Psi]$, and $P_1 \doteq P'_1 \in A\langle 1/x\rangle \ [\Psi]$, we say it *has their identification type* when for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi) \approx^{\Psi'} \mathsf{Id}_{x.A'\psi}(P'_0\psi, P'_1\psi)$, and $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi,P_1\psi)} -$ is the least relation such that

$$\langle x\rangle M \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi,P_1\psi)} \langle x\rangle M'$$

when $M \doteq M' \in A\psi \ [\Psi', x]$ and $M\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \ [\Psi']$ for all ε.

The PERs $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi,P_1\psi)} -$ and $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A'\psi}(P'_0\psi,P'_1\psi)} -$ are equal because $M \doteq M' \in A\psi \ [\Psi', x]$ if and only if $M \doteq M' \in A'\psi \ [\Psi', x]$, and $M\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \ [\Psi']$ if and only if $M\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P'_\varepsilon\psi \in A'\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \ [\Psi']$.

In the remainder of this subsection, we assume we are working with a cubical type system that has $A \doteq A' \ \mathsf{type} \ [\Psi, x]$, $P_0 \doteq P'_0 \in A\langle 0/x\rangle \ [\Psi]$, $P_1 \doteq P'_1 \in A\langle 1/x\rangle \ [\Psi]$, and their identification type.

Pretype $\mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1) \doteq \mathsf{Id}_{x.A'}(P'_0, P'_1) \ \mathsf{pretype} \ [\Psi]$.

For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$,

$$\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi_1\psi_2}(P_0\psi_1\psi_2, P_1\psi_1\psi_2) \approx^{\Psi_2} \mathsf{Id}_{x.A'\psi_1\psi_2}(P'_0\psi_1\psi_2, P'_1\psi_1\psi_2)$$

because the cubical type system has this identification type.

Introduction If $M \doteq M' \in A \ [\Psi, x]$ and $M\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P_\varepsilon \in A\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \ [\Psi]$ for all ε, then $\langle x\rangle M \doteq \langle x\rangle M' \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1) \ [\Psi]$.

Each side has coherent aspects up to syntactic equality, since $\langle x\rangle M\psi \ \mathsf{val} \ [\Psi']$ for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$. Thus it suffices to show $\langle x\rangle M\psi_1\psi_2 \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi_1\psi_2}(P_0\psi_1\psi_2,P_1\psi_1\psi_2)} \langle x\rangle M'\psi_1\psi_2$, which is true because $M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq M'\psi_1\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2 \ [\Psi_2, x]$ and $M\psi_1\psi_2\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P_\varepsilon\psi_1\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \ [\Psi_2]$ for all ε.

Elimination If $M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1)\ [\Psi]$ then $M@r \doteq M'@r \in A\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi]$ and $M@\varepsilon \doteq P_\varepsilon \in A\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi]$.

For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, we know $M\psi_1 \Downarrow \langle x\rangle N_1$ where $N_1 \in A\psi_1\ [\Psi_1, x]$. Thus $(M\psi_1)@r\psi_1 \longmapsto^* (\langle x\rangle N_1)@r\psi_1 \longmapsto N_1\langle r\psi_1/x\rangle$ where $N_1\langle r\psi_1/x\rangle \Downarrow X_1$ and $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\langle r/x\rangle\psi_1\psi_2} N_1\langle r\psi_1/x\rangle\psi_2$. We also know $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \langle x\rangle N_{12} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi_1\psi_2}(P_0\psi_1\psi_2, P_1\psi_1\psi_2)} \langle x\rangle N_1\psi_2$, so $N_{12} \doteq N_1\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2, x]$. Thus $(M\psi_1\psi_2)@r\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* (\langle x\rangle N_{12})@r\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto N_{12}\langle r\psi_1\psi_2/x\rangle$. We want to show $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\langle r/x\rangle\psi_1\psi_2} N_{12}\langle r\psi_1\psi_2/x\rangle$, which follows by $N_1\langle r\psi_1/x\rangle\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\langle r/x\rangle\psi_1\psi_2} N_{12}\langle r\psi_1\psi_2/x\rangle$ and transitivity.

An analogous argument shows $M'@r$ also has coherent aspects. To see that the aspects of $M@r$ and $M'@r$ are related to each other, we use the fact that $M'\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \langle x\rangle N'_{12}$ and $N_{12} \doteq N'_{12} \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2, x]$, so $(M'\psi_1\psi_2)@r\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* N'_{12}\langle r\psi_1\psi_2/x\rangle$ and $N_{12}\langle r\psi_1\psi_2/x\rangle \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\langle r/x\rangle\psi_1\psi_2} N'_{12}\langle r\psi_1\psi_2/x\rangle$.

For the second elimination rule, by Lemma 25 it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $(M\psi)@\varepsilon \sim^{\Psi'}_{A\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\psi} P_\varepsilon\psi$. But $M\psi \Downarrow \langle x\rangle N$ where $N \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x]$ and $N\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P_\varepsilon \in A\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$. Thus $(M\psi)@\varepsilon \longmapsto^* (\langle x\rangle N)@\varepsilon \longmapsto N\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle$ and $N\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \sim^{\Psi'}_{A\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\psi} P_\varepsilon\psi$.

Computation If $M \in A\ [\Psi, x]$ then $(\langle x\rangle M)@r \doteq M\langle r/x\rangle \in A\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi]$.

Follows from Lemma 24.

Eta If $M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1)\ [\Psi]$ then $M \doteq \langle x\rangle(M@x) \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1)\ [\Psi]$.

By the elimination and introduction rules for identification types, $\langle x\rangle(M@x) \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1)\ [\Psi]$. By Lemma 25 it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)} \langle x\rangle(M\psi@x)$. We know $M\psi \Downarrow \langle x\rangle N$ such that $N \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x]$ and $N\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$; we must show $N \doteq M\psi@x \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x]$. Again by Lemma 25, we show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to (\Psi', x)$, $N\psi' \sim^{\Psi''}_{A\psi\psi'} M\psi\psi'@x\psi'$. But $M\psi\psi' \Downarrow \langle x\rangle N' \approx^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(P_0\psi\psi', P_1\psi\psi')} \langle x\rangle N\psi'$, so $N' \doteq N\psi' \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'', x]$ and $M\psi\psi'@x\psi' \longmapsto^* (\langle x\rangle N')@x\psi' \longmapsto N'\langle x\psi'/x\rangle$. The result follows by $N'\langle x\psi'/x\rangle \doteq N\psi' \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'', x]$.

Kan $\mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1) \doteq \mathsf{Id}_{x.A'}(P'_0, P'_1)\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ are equally Kan.

For the first Kan condition, we must show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if

1. $M \doteq O \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N^\varepsilon_i \doteq N^{\varepsilon'}_j \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
3. $N^\varepsilon_i \doteq P^\varepsilon_i \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, and
4. $N^\varepsilon_i\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, then

$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N^\varepsilon_i}) \doteq \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A'\psi}(P'_0\psi, P'_1\psi)}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P^\varepsilon_i}) \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 24 on both sides and the introduction rule for identification types, it suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}, x}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M@x; \overrightarrow{y.N^\varepsilon_i@x}, _.P_0\psi, _.P_1\psi) \\ \doteq\ &\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}, x}_{A'\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O@x; \overrightarrow{y.P^\varepsilon_i@x}, _.P'_0\psi, _.P'_1\psi) \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x] \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathsf{hcom}\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$. These follow from the first and third Kan conditions of $A\psi \doteq A'\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi']$; most of the Kan conditions' hypotheses follow from the first elimination rule for identifications, but because we add a new pair of tubes, there are four additional hypotheses:

1. $P_\varepsilon\psi \doteq P'_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x, y \mid x = \varepsilon]$ for any ε.

   Since $x \# P_\varepsilon\psi$, this follows by $P_\varepsilon\psi \doteq P'_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi', y]$.

2. $N_i^\varepsilon@x \doteq P_{\varepsilon'}\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x, y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, x = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$.

   It suffices to show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to (\Psi', x, y)$ such that $x\psi' = \varepsilon'$ and $r_i\psi' = \varepsilon$, $(N_i^\varepsilon\psi')@\varepsilon' \doteq P_{\varepsilon'}\psi\psi' \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$, which follows from the second elimination rule for identifications.

3. $P_\varepsilon\psi \doteq P_{\varepsilon'}\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x, y \mid x = \varepsilon, x = \varepsilon']$ for any $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$.

   If $\varepsilon = \varepsilon'$ this follows by assumption; otherwise it holds vacuously.

4. $M@x \doteq P_\varepsilon\psi\langle r'/y\rangle \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x \mid x = \varepsilon]$ for any ε.

   It suffices to show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to (\Psi', x)$ such that $x\psi' = \varepsilon$, $M@\varepsilon \doteq P_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi'']$ (since $x, y \# P_\varepsilon$), which holds by the second elimination rule for identifications.

For the second Kan condition, we must show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if

1. $M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, then

$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi,P_1\psi)}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 24 and the eta and introduction rules for identifications, it suffices to show

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i},x}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M@x; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon@x}, _.P_0\psi, _.P_1\psi) \doteq M@x \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x]$$

which holds by the second Kan condition of $A\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi']$, deriving its hypotheses as before.

For the third Kan condition, we must show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if $r_i = \varepsilon$,

1. $M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, then

$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi,P_1\psi)}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 24 and the eta and introduction rules for identifications, it suffices to show

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i},x}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M@x; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon@x}, _.P_0\psi, _.P_1\psi) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle@x \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x]$$

which follows from the third Kan condition of $A\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi']$, deriving its hypotheses as before.

For the fourth Kan condition, we must show that for any $\psi : (\Psi', y) \to \Psi$, if

$$M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi\langle r/y\rangle}(P_0\psi\langle r/y\rangle, P_1\psi\langle r/y\rangle)\ [\Psi']$$

then

$$\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi,P_1\psi)}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{y.\mathsf{Id}_{x.A'\psi}(P'_0\psi,P'_1\psi)}(M') \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle}(P_0\psi\langle r'/y\rangle, P_1\psi\langle r'/y\rangle)\ [\Psi'].$$

By Lemma 24 on both sides and the introduction rule for identification types, it suffices to show

$$\mathsf{com}^{x}_{y.A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M@x; y.P_0\psi, y.P_1\psi) \doteq \mathsf{com}^{x}_{y.A'\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M'@x; y.P'_0\psi, y.P'_1\psi) \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle\ [\Psi', x]$$

and for all ε,

$$\mathsf{com}^{\varepsilon}_{y.A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M@\varepsilon; y.P_0\psi, y.P_1\psi) \doteq P_\varepsilon\psi\langle r'/y\rangle \in A\psi\langle r'/y\rangle\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi'].$$

These both follow from Theorem 35 once we have shown:

1. $M@x \doteq M'@x \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle\ [\Psi', x]$.
   Follows from the first elimination rule for identifications.
2. $P_\varepsilon\psi \doteq P_{\varepsilon'}\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x, y \mid x = \varepsilon, x = \varepsilon']$ for any $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$.
   Follows from $P_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi', y]$ if $\varepsilon = \varepsilon'$ and vacuously if $\varepsilon \neq \varepsilon'$.
3. $P_\varepsilon\psi \doteq P'_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x, y \mid x = \varepsilon]$ for any ε.
   Follows from $P_\varepsilon\psi \doteq P'_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi', y]$.
4. $P_\varepsilon\psi\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M@x \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle\ [\Psi', x \mid x = \varepsilon]$ for any ε.
   Follows from the second elimination rule for identifications.

For the fifth Kan condition, we must show that for any $\psi : (\Psi', y) \to \Psi$, if

$$M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi\langle r/y\rangle}(P_0\psi\langle r/y\rangle, P_1\psi\langle r/y\rangle)\ [\Psi']$$

then

$$\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{y.\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi,P_1\psi)}(M) \doteq M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi\langle r/y\rangle}(P_0\psi\langle r/y\rangle, P_1\psi\langle r/y\rangle)\ [\Psi'].$$

By Lemma 24 and the eta rule for identification types, it suffices to show

$$\mathsf{com}^{x}_{y.A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M@x; y.P_0\psi, y.P_1\psi) \doteq M@x \in A\psi\langle r/y\rangle\ [\Psi', x]$$

which follows from Theorem 35, establishing its hypotheses as before.

Cubical For any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi,P_1\psi)} M'$, we have $M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A\psi}(P_0\psi, P_1\psi)\ [\Psi']$.

Then $M = \langle x\rangle N$, $M' = \langle x\rangle N'$, $N \doteq N' \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x]$, $N\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P_\varepsilon\psi \in A\psi\langle\varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$ for all ε, and the result follows from the introduction rule for identification types.

4.6 Not

If a cubical type system has booleans, we say it *has the* not_x *type* when $\mathsf{not}_x \approx^{\Psi,x} \mathsf{not}_x$ for all Ψ, and $- \approx^{\Psi,x}_{\mathsf{not}_x} -$ is the least relation such that:

$$\mathsf{notel}_x(M) \approx^{\Psi,x}_{\mathsf{not}_x} \mathsf{notel}_x(M')$$

when $M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi, x]$.

This type is somewhat unusual because it exists primarily to be coerced along $(\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M))$, rather than to be introduced or eliminated in the manner of dependent function, pair, and identification types. Accordingly, the bulk of this section is dedicated to proving that $\mathsf{not}_x\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi, x]$ is Kan.

In the remainder of this section, we assume we are working with a cubical type system that has booleans and the not_x type. We will need the following lemmas, which hold in any cubical type system with booleans:

Lemma 40. *If* $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$ *then* $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M)) \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$.

Proof. Recalling that $\mathsf{not}(M)$ is notation for $\mathsf{if}_{_.\mathsf{bool}}(M; \mathsf{false}, \mathsf{true})$, we conclude from the introduction and elimination rules for booleans that $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M)) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$. By Lemma 25, it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi)) \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi$. We case on $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi$:

1. $M\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$.

   Then $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi)) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{true})) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{false}) \longmapsto \mathsf{true}$, and $\mathsf{true} \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{true}$.

2. $M\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{false}$.

   Then $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi)) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{false})) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{true}) \longmapsto \mathsf{false}$, and $\mathsf{false} \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{false}$.

3. $M\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.N^{\varepsilon}_i})$ where $r \neq r'$, $O \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$, $N^{\varepsilon}_i \doteq N^{\varepsilon'}_j \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi', y \mid x_i = \varepsilon, x_j = \varepsilon']$ for all $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and $N^{\varepsilon}_i\langle r/y\rangle \doteq O \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi' \mid x_i = \varepsilon]$ for all i, ε.

   Then, expanding the definition of com,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi)) &\longmapsto^* \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{_.\mathsf{bool}}(\mathsf{not}(O)); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{coe}^{y \rightsquigarrow r'}_{_.\mathsf{bool}}(\mathsf{not}(N^{\varepsilon}_i))})))\\ &\longmapsto \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{_.\mathsf{bool}}(\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{_.\mathsf{bool}}(\mathsf{not}(O)))); \dots)\end{aligned}$$

   which, by the elimination rule and first and fourth Kan conditions of bool, is

$$- \doteq \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(O)); \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(N^{\varepsilon}_i))) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi'].$$

   The result follows by the inductive hypothesis and the first Kan condition of bool. □

Lemma 41. *If* $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, $N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, *and for all* $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathsf{not}(M\psi) \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} N\psi$, *then* $M \doteq \mathsf{not}(N) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$ *(and in particular,* $M \sim^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(N)$*).*

Proof. By Lemma 25, $\mathsf{not}(M) \doteq N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$. Then $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M)) \doteq \mathsf{not}(N) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, so $M \doteq \mathsf{not}(N) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$. □

Pretype not_x $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi, x]$ and $\mathsf{not}_\varepsilon \doteq \mathsf{bool}$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$.

For the first part, there are three cases to consider. For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$,

1. If $x\psi_1 = \varepsilon$ then $\mathsf{not}_{x\psi_1} \Downarrow \mathsf{bool}$, $\mathsf{bool}\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{bool}$, and $\mathsf{not}_{x\psi_1\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{bool}$;
2. If $x\psi_1 = x'$ and $x'\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ then $\mathsf{not}_{x\psi_1} \Downarrow \mathsf{not}_{x'}$, $\mathsf{not}_{x'\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{bool}$, and $\mathsf{not}_{x\psi_1\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{bool}$; and
3. If $x\psi_1 = x'$ and $x'\psi_2 = x''$ then $\mathsf{not}_{x\psi_1} \Downarrow \mathsf{not}_{x'}$, $\mathsf{not}_{x'\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{not}_{x''}$, and $\mathsf{not}_{x\psi_1\psi_2} \Downarrow \mathsf{not}_{x''}$.

But $\mathsf{bool} \approx^{\Psi_2} \mathsf{bool}$ and $\mathsf{not}_{x''} \approx^{\Psi_2', x''} \mathsf{not}_{x''}$ where $\Psi_2 = (\Psi_2', x'')$.

For the second part, $\mathsf{not}_{\varepsilon\psi} \Downarrow \mathsf{bool}$ and $\mathsf{bool} \approx^{\Psi'} \mathsf{bool}$ for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$.

Introduction If $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$ then $\mathsf{notel}_r(M) \doteq \mathsf{notel}_r(N) \in \mathsf{not}_r\ [\Psi]$.

Let $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$.

1. If $r\psi_1 = 0$ then $\mathsf{notel}_0(M\psi_1) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1)$ and $\mathsf{notel}_0(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$. By $\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1) \doteq \mathsf{not}(N\psi_1) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$ we know $\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1) \Downarrow M_1'$, $\mathsf{not}(N\psi_1) \Downarrow N_1'$, and $M_1'\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_1'\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(N\psi_1\psi_2)$, which is what we wanted to show.
2. If $r\psi_1 = 1$ then $\mathsf{notel}_1(M\psi_1) \longmapsto M\psi_1$ and $\mathsf{notel}_1(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$. Our assumption directly implies $M\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1$, $N\psi_1 \Downarrow N_1$, and $M_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N\psi_1\psi_2$.
3. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = 0$ then $\mathsf{notel}_x(M\psi_1)$ val and $\mathsf{notel}_0(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$. Then by $\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \doteq \mathsf{not}(N\psi_1\psi_2) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ we conclude $\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(N\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(N\psi_1\psi_2)$.
4. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = 1$ then $\mathsf{notel}_x(M\psi_1)$ val and $\mathsf{notel}_1(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$. By our assumption, $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N\psi_1\psi_2$.
5. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = x'$ then $\mathsf{notel}_x(M\psi_1)$ val and $\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$ val. By $M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq N\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$, $\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N\psi_1\psi_2) \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N\psi_1\psi_2)$.

Computation If $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon \rightsquigarrow \varepsilon}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M) \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon \rightsquigarrow \overline{\varepsilon}}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M) \doteq \mathsf{not}(M) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$.

Follows from Lemma 24.

Kan $\mathsf{not}_\varepsilon \doteq \mathsf{bool}$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ are equally Kan, and not_x $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi, x]$ is Kan.

The first follows directly from Lemma 24 and the fact that bool $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ is Kan, because hcom and coe first evaluate their type argument and $\mathsf{not}_\varepsilon \longmapsto \mathsf{bool}$.

For the second, the operational semantics for hcom at not_x involve coe, so we start by proving the fourth Kan condition, which asserts that for any $\psi : (\Psi', x') \to (\Psi, x)$, if $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi\langle r/x'\rangle}\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_{x\psi}}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_{x\psi}}(N) \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi\langle r'/x'\rangle}\ [\Psi']$.

If $x\psi = \varepsilon$ then by Lemmas 24 and 29 it suffices to show $\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x'.\mathsf{bool}}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x'.\mathsf{bool}}(N) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$, which is the fourth Kan condition of bool. If $x\psi = y \neq x'$ then by Lemma 24 it suffices to show $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{not}_y\ [\Psi']$ when $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{not}_y\ [\Psi']$. Otherwise, $x\psi = x'$, and we must show that if $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{not}_r\ [\Psi']$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_{x'}}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_{x'}}(N) \in \mathsf{not}_{r'}\ [\Psi']$. Establishing this requires a large case split; we focus on the unary version because the binary one follows easily. Let $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi'$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$.

1. If $r\psi_1 = \varepsilon$ and $r'\psi_1 = \varepsilon$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon\rightsquigarrow\varepsilon}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1) \longmapsto M\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1$, and $\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon\rightsquigarrow\varepsilon}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$ where $M_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$.

2. If $r\psi_1 = \varepsilon$ and $r'\psi_1 = \overline{\varepsilon}$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon\rightsquigarrow\overline{\varepsilon}}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1) \Downarrow X_1$, and $\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon\rightsquigarrow\overline{\varepsilon}}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$. By Lemma 29 we know $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$ so $\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$ and therefore $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$.

3. If $r\psi_1 = 1$ and $r'\psi_1 = x$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_x(M\psi_1)$.

   (a) If $x\psi_2 = 1$ then $\mathsf{notel}_1(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$ and $\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$, where $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$.

   (b) If $x\psi_2 = 0$ then $\mathsf{notel}_0(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$, $\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$, and the result follows from $M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$.

   (c) If $x\psi_2 = x'$ then $\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2)\ \mathsf{val}$ and $\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow x'}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$, and so $\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$ because $M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$.

4. If $r\psi_1 = 0$ and $r'\psi_1 = x$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow x}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_x(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1))$.

   (a) If $x\psi_2 = 0$ then $\mathsf{notel}_0(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2))$ and $\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$. By $M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ we have $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)) \doteq M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ and in particular $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$.

   (b) If $x\psi_2 = 1$ then $\mathsf{notel}_1(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$, $\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$, and the result follows from $\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$.

   (c) If $x\psi_2 = x'$ then $\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2))\ \mathsf{val}$, $\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow x'}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2))$, and the result follows from $\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$.

5. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $r'\psi_1 = 1$ then $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$ and so $M\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_x(N)$ where $N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$. Therefore $\mathsf{coe}^{x\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{x\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_x(N)) \longmapsto^* N \Downarrow N_0$.

   (a) If $x\psi_2 = 1$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$. By $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$ we know that $\mathsf{notel}_1(N\psi_2) \longmapsto N\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$ and by $N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$ we know $N\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_0\psi_2$. We conclude $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_0\psi_2$ as desired.

   (b) If $x\psi_2 = 0$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$, and we must show $\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_0\psi_2$. By $N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$, it suffices to show $\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N\psi_2$. By $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$ we know that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi_2$, $\mathsf{notel}_0(N\psi_2\psi) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2\psi) \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2\psi$, and the result follows by Lemma 41.

   (c) If $x\psi_2 = x'$ then $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N') \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N\psi_2)$ where $N' \doteq N\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$, and $\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N')) \longmapsto^* N'$. Then $N\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_0\psi_2$ and $N' \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N\psi_2$ so we have $N' \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N_0\psi_2$.

6. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $r'\psi_1 = 0$ then $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$ and so $M\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_x(N)$ where $N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$. Therefore $\mathsf{coe}^{x\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{x\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_x(N)) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{not}(N) \Downarrow X_1$.

(a) If $x\psi_2 = 0$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$. By $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$ we know that $\mathsf{notel}_0(N\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$, and by $\mathsf{not}(N) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$ we know $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2)$. Thus $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} X_1\psi_2$.

(b) If $x\psi_2 = 1$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$. By $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$ we know that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi_2$, $\mathsf{notel}_1(N\psi_2\psi) \longmapsto N\psi_2\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2\psi$, so by Lemma 25, $N\psi_2 \doteq M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$, and thus $\mathsf{not}(N\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$. By $\mathsf{not}(N) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$, we know $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2)$. Therefore $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$.

(c) If $x\psi_2 = x'$ then $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N') \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N\psi_2)$ where $N' \doteq N\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$, and $\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N')) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{not}(N')$. Then $\mathsf{not}(N') \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2)$, and by $\mathsf{not}(N) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$, $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2)$, so $\mathsf{not}(N') \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} X_1\psi_2$.

7. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $r'\psi_1 = y$ then $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$ and so $M\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_x(N)$ where $N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$. Therefore $\mathsf{coe}^{x\rightsquigarrow y}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{x\rightsquigarrow y}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_x(N)) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{notel}_y(N)$.

(a) If $x\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ and $y\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon\rightsquigarrow\varepsilon}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$. By $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$, we have $\mathsf{notel}_\varepsilon(N\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2$ as desired.

(b) If $x\psi_2 = 0$ and $y\psi_2 = 1$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$, and $\mathsf{notel}_1(N\psi_2) \longmapsto N\psi_2$. By $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$, for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi_2$, $\mathsf{notel}_0(N\psi_2\psi) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2\psi) \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2\psi$, so by Lemma 41 we have $N\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$ as desired.

(c) If $x\psi_2 = 1$ and $y\psi_2 = 0$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$, and $\mathsf{notel}_0(N\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2)$. By $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$, for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi_2$, $\mathsf{notel}_1(N\psi_2\psi) \longmapsto N\psi_2\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2\psi$, so by Lemma 25 $N\psi_2 \doteq M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ and so $\mathsf{not}(N\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$.

(d) If $x\psi_2 = 1$ and $y\psi_2 = y'$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow y'}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_{y'}(M\psi_1\psi_2)$, and $\mathsf{notel}_{y'}(N\psi_2)\ \mathsf{val}$. By $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$, for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi_2$, $\mathsf{notel}_1(N\psi_2\psi) \longmapsto N\psi_2\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2\psi$, so by Lemma 25, $N\psi_2 \doteq M\psi_1\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ and so $\mathsf{notel}_{y'}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{y'}} \mathsf{notel}_{y'}(N\psi_2)$.

(e) If $x\psi_2 = 0$ and $y\psi_2 = y'$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow y'}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_{y'}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2))$, and $\mathsf{notel}_{y'}(N\psi_2)\ \mathsf{val}$. By $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi_1]$, for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi_2$, $\mathsf{notel}_0(N\psi_2\psi) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2\psi) \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi_1\psi_2\psi$, so by Lemma 41, $N\psi_2 \doteq \mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ and so $\mathsf{notel}_{y'}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi_1\psi_2)) \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{y'}} \mathsf{notel}_{y'}(N\psi_2)$.

(f) If $x\psi_2 = x'$ and $y\psi_2 = 1$ then $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N') \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N\psi_2)$ where $N' \doteq N\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$. Moreover, $\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N')) \longmapsto^* N'$, and $\mathsf{notel}_1(N\psi_2) \longmapsto N\psi_2$. Then $N' \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} N\psi_2$ as desired.

(g) If $x\psi_2 = x'$ and $y\psi_2 = 0$ then $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N') \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N\psi_2)$ where $N' \doteq N\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$. Moreover, $\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 0}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N')) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{not}(N')$, and $\mathsf{notel}_0(N\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2)$. Then $\mathsf{not}(N') \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(N\psi_2)$ as desired.

(h) If $x\psi_2 = x'$ and $y\psi_2 = y'$ then $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N') \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N\psi_2)$ where $N' \doteq N\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$. Moreover, $\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow y'}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow y'}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N')) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_{y'}(N')$, $\mathsf{notel}_{y'}(N\psi_2)\ \mathsf{val}$, and $\mathsf{notel}_{y'}(N') \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{notel}_{y'}(N\psi_2)$ as desired.

The fifth Kan condition asserts that for any $\psi : (\Psi', x') \to (\Psi, x)$, if $M \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi\langle r/x'\rangle}\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_{x\psi}}(M) \doteq M \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi\langle r/x'\rangle}\ [\Psi']$. By Lemma 25, it suffices to show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_{x\psi\psi'}}(M\psi') \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi\langle r/x'\rangle\psi'}} M\psi'$; we already know $M\psi' \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi\langle r/x'\rangle\psi'}} M\psi'$.

1. $x\psi\psi' = \varepsilon$. Then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_\varepsilon}(M\psi') \longmapsto M\psi'$.
2. $x\psi\psi' = y \neq x'$. Then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_y}(M\psi') \longmapsto M\psi'$.
3. $x\psi\psi' = x'$ and $r\psi' = \varepsilon$. Then $\mathsf{coe}^{\varepsilon\rightsquigarrow\varepsilon}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_{x'}}(M\psi') \longmapsto M\psi'$.
4. $x\psi\psi' = x'$ and $r\psi' = y$. Then $\mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow y}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_{x'}}(M\psi') \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{y\rightsquigarrow y}_{x'.\mathsf{not}_{x'}}(\mathsf{notel}_y(N)) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_y(N)$, where $M\psi' \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_y(N)$ and $N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi'']$; thus $\mathsf{notel}_y(N) \approx^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{not}_y} \mathsf{notel}_y(N)$, which is what we wanted to show.

The proofs of the first three Kan conditions rely on the fourth Kan condition, as well as one additional lemma:

Lemma 42. *If $M \in \mathsf{not}_r\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{notel}_r(\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M)) \doteq M \in \mathsf{not}_r\ [\Psi]$.*

Proof. The introduction rule and fourth Kan condition of not_x imply $\mathsf{notel}_r(\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M)) \in \mathsf{not}_r\ [\Psi]$. Therefore by Lemma 25 it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathsf{notel}_{r\psi}(\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi)) \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{not}_{r\psi}} M\psi$.

1. If $r\psi = 0$ then $\mathsf{notel}_0(\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi)) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi)) \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi))$. By Lemma 29, $M\psi \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$, so $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi)) \doteq M\psi \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$ and therefore $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{not}(M\psi)) \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi$.
2. If $r\psi = 1$ then $\mathsf{notel}_1(\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi)) \longmapsto \mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi) \longmapsto M\psi$, and $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi$.
3. If $r\psi = x$ then $\mathsf{notel}_x(\mathsf{coe}^{x\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi))\ \mathsf{val}$. We know $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{not}_x} M\psi$, so $M\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_x(N)$ where $N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$. To show $\mathsf{notel}_x(\mathsf{coe}^{x\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi)) \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{not}_x} \mathsf{notel}_x(N)$, we must show $\mathsf{coe}^{x\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi) \doteq N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$. Again, by Lemma 25 it suffices to show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, $\mathsf{coe}^{x\psi'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi\psi') \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{bool}} N\psi'$.
   (a) If $x\psi' = 0$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi\psi') \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(M\psi\psi')$. Because $M\psi \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi']$ and $M\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_x(N)$, we know that for any $\psi'' : \Psi''' \to \Psi''$, $\mathsf{notel}_0(N\psi'\psi'') \longmapsto \mathsf{not}(N\psi'\psi'') \sim^{\Psi'''}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi\psi'\psi''$. Therefore by Lemma 41 we have $\mathsf{not}(M\psi\psi') \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{bool}} N\psi'$, which is what we needed.
   (b) If $x\psi' = 1$ then $\mathsf{coe}^{1\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi\psi') \longmapsto M\psi\psi'$. By $M\psi \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi']$ and $M\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_x(N)$, we have $\mathsf{notel}_1(N\psi') \longmapsto N\psi' \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{bool}} M\psi\psi'$, which is what we needed.
   (c) If $x\psi' = x'$ then by $M\psi \in \mathsf{not}_x\ [\Psi']$ and $M\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_x(N)$, we have $\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N\psi') \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} M\psi\psi'$, so $M\psi\psi' \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N')$ and $N\psi' \doteq N' \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi'']$. Therefore $\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi\psi') \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(N')) \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_1(N') \longmapsto N'$ and we must show $N' \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'}} N\psi'$, which follows from $N\psi' \doteq N' \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi'']$. □

In particular, if $M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{coe}^{0\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M)) \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]$.
The first Kan condition asserts that, for any $\psi : \Psi' \to (\Psi, x)$, if

1. $M \doteq O \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
3. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, and
4. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, then

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon}) \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi']$.

Let $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi'$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$. We will again focus on the unary case.

1. If $x\psi\psi_1 = \varepsilon$ then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi_1}}_{\mathsf{not}_\varepsilon}(r\psi_1 \rightsquigarrow r'\psi_1, M\psi_1; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1}) \in \mathsf{not}_\varepsilon\ [\Psi_1]$ by the first Kan condition of $\mathsf{not}_\varepsilon\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi_1]$. Therefore $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1 \Downarrow X_1$ and $X_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2$.
2. If $x\psi\psi_1 = x'$ then

$$\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi_1}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r\psi_1 \rightsquigarrow r'\psi_1, \mathsf{coe}^{x' \rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{coe}^{x' \rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1)})).$$

   Let H be the argument of the above $\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(-)$; we must show that $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'\psi_2}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'\psi_2}(H\psi_2)$. By the fourth Kan condition of $\mathsf{not}_x\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi_1, x]$ and the first Kan condition of $\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi_1]$, $H \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_1]$.

   (a) If $x'\psi_2 = 0$ then each side of $\mathsf{hcom}\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x'\psi_2}} \mathsf{notel}_{x'\psi_2}(H\psi_2)$ steps once to:

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi_1\psi_2}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r\psi_1\psi_2 \rightsquigarrow r'\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1\psi_2}) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(H\psi_2).$$

   If some $r_i\psi_1\psi_2 = \varepsilon$ then by the elimination rule and third Kan condition of $\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi_2]$, it suffices to show $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{coe}^{0 \rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi_1\psi_2))$, which follows from Lemma 42.
   If $r\psi_1\psi_2 = r'\psi_1\psi_2$, then by the elimination rule and second Kan condition of $\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi_2]$, it suffices to show $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} \mathsf{not}(\mathsf{coe}^{0 \rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2))$, which follows from Lemma 42.
   If all $r_i\psi_1\psi_2$ are dimension names and $r\psi_1\psi_2 \neq r'\psi_1\psi_2$, then the left-hand side is a value and the right-hand side steps twice to

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi_1\psi_2}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r\psi_1\psi_2 \rightsquigarrow r'\psi_1\psi_2, \mathsf{coe}^{r\psi_1\psi_2 \rightsquigarrow r'\psi_1\psi_2}_{_.\mathsf{bool}}(\mathsf{not}(\mathsf{coe}^{0 \rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2))); \dots)$$

   which $\doteq$ the left-hand side by Lemma 42, the first Kan condition of $\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi_2]$, and Lemma 24.

   (b) If $x'\psi_2 = 1$ then each side steps once to

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi_1\psi_2}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r\psi_1\psi_2 \rightsquigarrow r'\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi_1\psi_2}) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{bool}} H\psi_2$$

   which follows by the first Kan condition of $\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi_2]$ and $M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{1 \rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi_1\psi_2) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$ (by the computation rule for not_x).

   (c) If $x'\psi_2 = x''$ then each side steps once to

$$\mathsf{notel}_{x''}(H\psi_2) \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{not}_{x''}} \mathsf{notel}_{x''}(H\psi_2)$$

   which follows from $H\psi_2 \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi_2]$.

The second Kan condition asserts that, for any $\psi : \Psi' \to (\Psi, x)$, if

1. $M \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi}}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 25, it suffices to show that for all $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$,

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi\psi'}}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r\psi', M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}) \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi\psi'}} M\psi'.$$

1. If $x\psi\psi' = \varepsilon$ then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{\mathsf{not}_\varepsilon}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r\psi', M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}) \doteq M\psi' \in \mathsf{not}_\varepsilon\ [\Psi'']$ by the second Kan condition of not_ε pretype $[\Psi'']$.
2. If $x\psi\psi' = x'$ then the left side steps to

$$\mathsf{notel}_{x'}(\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r\psi', \mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi'); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi')}))$$

   The second Kan condition of bool (along with the introduction rule of $\mathsf{not}_{x'}$ and fourth Kan condition of not_x pretype $[\Psi'', x]$) implies this is $- \doteq \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi')) \in \mathsf{not}_{x'}\ [\Psi'']$ which by Lemma 42 is $- \doteq M\psi' \in \mathsf{not}_{x'}\ [\Psi'']$.

The third Kan condition asserts that, for any $\psi : \Psi' \to (\Psi, x)$, if $r_i = \varepsilon$ for some i,

1. $M \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi']$.

By Lemma 25, it suffices to show that for all $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$,

$$\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi\psi'}}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}) \sim^{\Psi''}_{\mathsf{not}_{x\psi\psi'}} N_i^\varepsilon\psi'\langle r'\psi'/y\rangle.$$

1. If $x\psi\psi' = \varepsilon'$ then by the third Kan condition of $\mathsf{not}_{\varepsilon'}$ pretype $[\Psi'']$ (since $r_i\psi' = \varepsilon$), $\mathsf{hcom}\psi' \doteq N^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi' \in \mathsf{not}_{\varepsilon'}\ [\Psi_1]$.
2. If $x\psi\psi' = x'$ then

$$\mathsf{hcom}\psi' \longmapsto \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', \mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(M\psi'); \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi')}))$$

   By the introduction rule for $\mathsf{not}_{x'}$ and the third Kan condition of bool, this term is $- \doteq \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(\mathsf{coe}^{x'\rightsquigarrow 1}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi')) \in \mathsf{not}_{x'}\ [\Psi'']$, which by Lemma 42 is $- \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle\psi' \in \mathsf{not}_{x'}\ [\Psi'']$.

Cubical For any $\psi : \Psi' \to (\Psi, x)$ and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{A_0} N$ (where $\mathsf{not}_{x\psi} \Downarrow A_0$) then $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{not}_{x\psi}\ [\Psi']$.

If $x\psi = \varepsilon$ then $A_0 = \mathsf{bool}$ and $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$ (because bool pretype $[\Psi']$ is cubical), so $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{not}_\varepsilon\ [\Psi']$. If $x\psi = x'$ then $M = \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(O)$, $N = \mathsf{notel}_{x'}(P)$, $O \doteq P \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi']$, and the result follows by the introduction rule for $\mathsf{not}_{x'}$.

5 Proof theory

As mentioned in the introduction, there is wide latitude in the choice of proof theories for computational type theory. Here we consider some rules inspired by the formal cubical type theories given by Cohen et al. [2016] and Licata and Brunerie [2014] so as to make clear that our computational semantics are a valid interpretation of those rules. However, these semantics may be used to justify concepts, such as strict types, that are not currently considered in the formal setting. We emphasize that there is no strong reason to limit consideration to inductively defined proof theories. The role of a proof theory is to provide access to the truth, in particular to support mechanization. But there are methods of accessing the truth, such as decision procedures for arithmetic, that do not fit into the conventional setup for proof theory.

For the sake of concision and clarity, we state the following rules in *local form*, extending them to *global form* by *uniformity*, also called *naturality*. (This format was suggested by Martin-Löf [1984], itself inspired by Gentzen's original concept of natural deduction.) All the rules for dependent function and pair types should include the hypotheses $A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$ and $a : A \gg B\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$; the rules for identification types should include the hypothesis $A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$.

Recall that Ψ and Ξ are unordered sets, and the equations in Ξ are also unordered. $\mathcal{J}$ stands for any type equality or element equality judgment. Rather than stating every rule with an arbitrary context restriction Ξ, we introduce context restrictions in the hypotheses of the hcom typing rules, and discharge them with a special set of "restriction rules."

While the theorems in Section 4 are stated only for closed terms, the corresponding generalizations to open-term sequents follow by the definition of the open judgments, the fact that the introduction and elimination rules respect equality (proven in Section 4), and the fact that all substitutions commute with term formers.

Structural rules

$$\frac{A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}{a : A \gg a \in A\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi] \quad A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}{a : A \gg \mathcal{J}\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi] \quad \psi : \Psi' \to \Psi}{\mathcal{J}\psi\ [\Psi']}$$

$$\frac{A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}{A' \doteq A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad A' \doteq A''\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}{A \doteq A''\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M' \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]}{M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi] \quad M' \doteq M'' \in A\ [\Psi]}{M \doteq M'' \in A\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi] \quad A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}{M \doteq M' \in A'\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : A \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad N \doteq N' \in A\ [\Psi]}{B[N/a] \doteq B'[N'/a]\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{a : A \gg M \doteq M' \in B\ [\Psi] \quad N \doteq N' \in A\ [\Psi]}{M[N/a] \doteq M'[N'/a] \in B[N/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

Dependent function types

$$\frac{A \doteq A' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad a : A \gg B \doteq B' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}{(a{:}A) \to B \doteq (a{:}A') \to B' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : A \gg M \doteq M' \in B\ [\Psi]}{\lambda a.M \doteq \lambda a.M' \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \doteq M' \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi] \quad N \doteq N' \in A\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{app}(M, N) \doteq \mathsf{app}(M', N') \in B[N/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : A \gg M \in B\ [\Psi] \quad N \in A\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{app}(\lambda a.M, N) \doteq M[N/a] \in B[N/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]}{M \doteq \lambda a.\mathsf{app}(M, a) \in (a{:}A) \to B\ [\Psi]}$$

Dependent pair types

$$\frac{A \doteq A' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad a : A \gg B \doteq B' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}{(a{:}A) \times B \doteq (a{:}A') \times B' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi] \quad N \doteq N' \in B[M/a]\ [\Psi]}{\langle M, N\rangle \doteq \langle M', N'\rangle \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{P \doteq P' \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{fst}(P) \doteq \mathsf{fst}(P') \in A\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{P \doteq P' \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{snd}(P) \doteq \mathsf{snd}(P') \in B[\mathsf{fst}(P)/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \in A\ [\Psi] \quad N \in B[M/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{fst}(\langle M, N\rangle) \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{M \in A\ [\Psi] \quad N \in B[M/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{snd}(\langle M, N\rangle) \doteq N \in B[M/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{P \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]}{P \doteq \langle \mathsf{fst}(P), \mathsf{snd}(P)\rangle \in (a{:}A) \times B\ [\Psi]}$$

Identification types

$$\frac{A \doteq A' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x] \quad P_0 \doteq P_0' \in A\langle 0/x\rangle\ [\Psi] \quad P_1 \doteq P_1' \in A\langle 1/x\rangle\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1) \doteq \mathsf{Id}_{x.A'}(P_0', P_1') \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi, x] \quad M\langle 0/x\rangle \doteq P_0 \in A\langle 0/x\rangle\ [\Psi] \quad M\langle 1/x\rangle \doteq P_1 \in A\langle 1/x\rangle\ [\Psi]}{\langle x\rangle M \doteq \langle x\rangle M' \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1)\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1)\ [\Psi]}{M@r \doteq M'@r \in A\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1)\ [\Psi]}{M@\varepsilon \doteq P_\varepsilon \in A\langle \varepsilon/x\rangle\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \in A\ [\Psi, x]}{(\langle x\rangle M)@r \doteq M\langle r/x\rangle \in A\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1)\ [\Psi]}{M \doteq \langle x\rangle(M@x) \in \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1)\ [\Psi]}$$

Booleans

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{false} \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : \mathsf{bool} \gg A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi] \quad T \doteq T' \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi] \quad F \doteq F' \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(M; T, F) \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.A'}(M'; T', F') \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : \mathsf{bool} \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi] \quad F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(\mathsf{true}; T, F) \doteq T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : \mathsf{bool} \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi] \quad F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{if}_{a.A}(\mathsf{false}; T, F) \doteq F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

Circle

$$\frac{}{\mathbb{S}^1\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{base} \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{loop}_r \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{loop}_\varepsilon \doteq \mathsf{base} \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{rl} & a : \mathbb{S}^1 \gg A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \\ & M \doteq M' \in \mathbb{S}^1\ [\Psi] \\ & P \doteq P' \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi] \\ & L \doteq L' \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x] \\ (\forall \varepsilon) & L\langle \varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi] \end{array}}{\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(M; P, x.L) \doteq \mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A'}(M'; P', x.L') \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : \mathbb{S}^1 \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad L \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x] \quad (\forall \varepsilon)\ L\langle \varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(\mathsf{base}; P, x.L) \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : \mathbb{S}^1 \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad L \in A[\mathsf{loop}_x/a]\ [\Psi, x] \quad (\forall \varepsilon)\ L\langle \varepsilon/x\rangle \doteq P \in A[\mathsf{base}/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathbb{S}^1\text{-}\mathsf{elim}_{a.A}(\mathsf{loop}_r; P, x.L) \doteq L\langle r/x\rangle \in A[\mathsf{loop}_r/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

Hcom

$$\frac{\begin{array}{ll} & A \doteq A' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \\ & M \doteq O \in A\ [\Psi] \\ (\forall i, \varepsilon) & N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in A\ [\Psi, y \mid r_i = \varepsilon] \\ (\forall i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon') & N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in A\ [\Psi, y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon'] \\ (\forall i, \varepsilon) & N_i^\varepsilon \langle r/y \rangle \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi \mid r_i = \varepsilon] \end{array}}{\mathsf{hcom}_A^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{hcom}_{A'}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon}) \in A\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{ll} & A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \\ & M \in A\ [\Psi] \\ (\forall i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon') & N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in A\ [\Psi, y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon'] \\ (\forall i, \varepsilon) & N_i^\varepsilon \langle r/y \rangle \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi \mid r_i = \varepsilon] \end{array}}{\mathsf{hcom}_A^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{ll} & A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \\ & M \in A\ [\Psi] \\ (\forall i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon') & N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in A\ [\Psi, y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon'] \\ (\forall i, \varepsilon) & N_i^\varepsilon \langle r/y \rangle \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi \mid r_i = \varepsilon] \end{array}}{\mathsf{hcom}_A^{r_1, \ldots, r_{i-1}, \varepsilon, r_{i+1}, \ldots, r_n}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon \langle r'/y \rangle \in A\ [\Psi]}$$

Restriction rules

$$\frac{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi]}{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi \mid \cdot]} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi \mid \Xi]}{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi \mid \Xi, r = r]}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi \mid \Xi, 0 = 1]} \qquad \frac{}{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 0, x = 1]}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{J}\langle \varepsilon/x \rangle\ [\Psi]}{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi, x \mid x = \varepsilon]} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{J}\langle \varepsilon/x \rangle \langle \varepsilon'/y \rangle\ [\Psi]}{\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi, x, y \mid x = \varepsilon, y = \varepsilon']}$$

Coe

$$\frac{A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x] \quad M \doteq N \in A\langle r/x \rangle\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{coe}_{x.A}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}_{x.A'}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}(N) \in A\langle r'/x \rangle\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x] \quad M \in A\langle r/x \rangle\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{coe}_{x.A}^{r \rightsquigarrow r}(M) \doteq M \in A\langle r/x \rangle\ [\Psi]}$$

Not

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{not}_r\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{not}_\varepsilon \doteq \mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{coe}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}^{\varepsilon \rightsquigarrow \varepsilon}(M) \doteq M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{M \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{coe}_{x.\mathsf{not}_x}^{\varepsilon \rightsquigarrow \overline{\varepsilon}}(M) \doteq \mathsf{not}(M) \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi]}$$

A Further developments

This appendix contains results obtained since July 2016.

A.1 Strict booleans

Extend the term syntax by sbool, and the operational semantics by

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{sbool}\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{sbool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^{\varepsilon}}) \longmapsto M} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{sbool}}(M) \longmapsto M}$$

A cubical type system *has strict booleans* if $\mathsf{sbool} \approx^{\Psi} \mathsf{sbool}$ for all Ψ, and $- \approx^{-}_{\mathsf{sbool}} -$ is the least relation such that:

$$\mathsf{true} \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{sbool}} \mathsf{true} \text{ and } \mathsf{false} \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{sbool}} \mathsf{false}.$$

In the remainder of this subsection, we consider cubical type systems that have strict booleans.

Pretype $\mathsf{sbool}\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$.

For all ψ_1, ψ_2, $\mathsf{sbool}\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{sbool}$, $\mathsf{sbool}\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{sbool}$, $\mathsf{sbool}\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{sbool}$, and $\mathsf{sbool} \approx^{\Psi_2} \mathsf{sbool}$.

Introduction $\mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{false} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$.

For all $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, $\mathsf{true}\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$, $\mathsf{true}\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$, $\mathsf{true}\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$, and $\mathsf{true} \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{sbool}} \mathsf{true}$. The false case is analogous.

Unlike the ordinary booleans, all strict booleans (at all dimensions) are equal to either true or false. This fact justifies our treatment of hcom at sbool, and the extensionality rule proven below.

Lemma 43. *If* $M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$ *then either* $M \doteq \mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$ *or* $M \doteq \mathsf{false} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$.

Proof. Then $M \Downarrow M_0$ where $M_0 \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{sbool}} M_0$, so either $M_0 = \mathsf{true}$ or $M_0 = \mathsf{false}$. In the former case, for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathsf{true}\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{sbool}} M\psi$, so by Lemma 25 and the introduction rule for strict booleans, $M \doteq \mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$. The false case is analogous. □

Elimination If $M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$, $a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, $T \doteq T' \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$, and $F \doteq F' \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{if}_{a.B}(M; T, F) \doteq \mathsf{if}_{a.B'}(M'; T', F') \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]$. (Note that the motive of the if is ignored in the relevant portion of the operational semantics, so it need not agree with the desired type.)

By Lemma 43, either $M \doteq \mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$ or $M \doteq \mathsf{false} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$. We consider the former case; the latter is symmetric. Then for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $M\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$ so $\mathsf{if}_{a.B\psi}(M\psi; T\psi, F\psi) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{if}_{a.B\psi}(\mathsf{true}; T\psi, F\psi) \longmapsto T\psi$. Similarly, $M'\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{true}$, and so by Lemma 24 on both sides, it suffices to show $T \doteq T' \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]$. This follows from $A[\mathsf{true}/a] \doteq A[M/a]\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$.

Extensionality If $a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg M \in A\ [\Psi]$, $a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg M' \in A\ [\Psi]$, $M[\mathsf{true}/a] \doteq M'[\mathsf{true}/a] \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$, $M[\mathsf{false}/a] \doteq M'[\mathsf{false}/a] \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$, and $N \doteq N' \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$, then $M[N/a] \doteq M'[N'/a] \in A[N/a]\ [\Psi]$.

By Lemma 43, either $N \doteq \mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$ or $N \doteq \mathsf{false} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]$. In the former case, because $a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg M \in A\ [\Psi]$, we know that $M[\mathsf{true}/a] \doteq M[N/a] \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$ and similarly for M'. By our assumption $M[\mathsf{true}/a] \doteq M'[\mathsf{true}/a] \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$, and the fact that $A[\mathsf{true}/a] \doteq A[N/a]\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$, we conclude $M[N/a] \doteq M'[N'/a] \in A[N/a]\ [\Psi]$ as required. The false case is similar.

Computation If $a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, $T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$, and $F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$, then $\mathsf{if}_{a.B}(\mathsf{true}; T, F) \doteq T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{if}_{a.B}(\mathsf{false}; T, F) \doteq F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]$.

For all ψ, $\mathsf{if}_{a.B\psi}(\mathsf{true}; T\psi, F\psi) \longmapsto T\psi$, so the former follows by Lemma 24 and $T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]$. The latter case is analogous.

Kan $\mathsf{sbool}\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ is Kan.

The first Kan condition requires that for any Ψ', if

1. $M \doteq O \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
3. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq P_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε, and
4. $N_i^\varepsilon \langle r/y \rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{sbool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{sbool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^\varepsilon}) \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$.

For all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathsf{hcom}\psi \longmapsto M\psi$, so by Lemma 24 on both sides, it suffices to show $M \doteq O \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$, which is the first assumption.

The second Kan condition requires that for any Ψ', if

1. $M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon \langle r/y \rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{sbool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$.

Again, by Lemma 24, this follows from $M \doteq M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$.

The third Kan condition requires that for any Ψ', if $r_i = \varepsilon$ for some i,

1. $M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon \langle r/y \rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{sbool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon \langle r'/y \rangle \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$.

The second hypothesis implies that $N_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi', y \mid \varepsilon = \varepsilon]$, and hence that $N_i^\varepsilon \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi', y]$. By Lemma 43, $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq \mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi', y]$ or $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq \mathsf{false} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi', y]$. Assume the former; then $N_i^\varepsilon \langle r/y \rangle \doteq \mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$ and $N_i^\varepsilon \langle r'/y \rangle \doteq \mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$, so by the third hypothesis, $M \doteq \mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$. The result follows by Lemma 24.

The fourth Kan condition asserts that for any Ψ', if $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{sbool}}(M) \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{sbool}}(N) \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$. This follows immediately by Lemma 24.

The fifth Kan condition requires that for any Ψ', if $M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r}_{x.\mathsf{sbool}}(M) \doteq M \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$. This again follows immediately by Lemma 24.

Cubical For any Ψ' and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{sbool}} N$, $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi']$.

Then $M = N = \mathsf{true}$ or $M = N = \mathsf{false}$; in each case, this follows by the introduction rule for strict booleans.

The above construction justifies adding the following rules to those found in Section 5:

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{sbool\ type}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{true} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{false} \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi] \quad T \doteq T' \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi] \quad F \doteq F' \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{if}(M; T, F) \doteq \mathsf{if}(M'; T', F') \in A[M/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi] \quad F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{if}(\mathsf{true}; T, F) \doteq T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \quad T \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi] \quad F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{if}(\mathsf{false}; T, F) \doteq F \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} N \doteq N' \in \mathsf{sbool}\ [\Psi] \\ a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg M \in A\ [\Psi] \\ a : \mathsf{sbool} \gg M' \in A\ [\Psi] \\ M[\mathsf{true}/a] \doteq M'[\mathsf{true}/a] \in A[\mathsf{true}/a]\ [\Psi] \\ M[\mathsf{false}/a] \doteq M'[\mathsf{false}/a] \in A[\mathsf{false}/a]\ [\Psi] \end{array}}{M[N/a] \doteq M'[N'/a] \in A[N/a]\ [\Psi]}$$

A.2 Fixed point constructions

Section 5 relies on the existence of a cubical type system with booleans, the circle, all dependent function, pair, and identification types, and the not_x type. Here we give an explicit fixed point construction of the least such cubical type system.

Let VPER denote the collection of ternary relations $R(\Psi, M, N)$ over $M\ \mathsf{val}\ [\Psi]$ and $N\ \mathsf{val}\ [\Psi]$, such that $R(\Psi, -, -)$ is symmetric and transitive. Define the *approximation ordering* $R \sqsubseteq S$ by

$$R \subseteq S \wedge \forall \Psi, M.\, (R(\Psi, M, M) \implies (R(\Psi, M, -) = S(\Psi, M, -)))$$

That is, $R \subseteq S$ and any element of both R and S has identical equivalence classes in each.

Lemma 44. $(\mathsf{VPER}, \sqsubseteq)$ *is a complete partial order, i.e.,* $\sqsubseteq$ *is a partial order with a least element and joins of all directed subsets.*

Proof. The relation $\sqsubseteq$ is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive because $\subseteq$ is, and the condition on equivalence classes is reflexive and transitive. The empty relation is $\sqsubseteq$ all other VPERs.

Assume $\{R_i\}_i$ is a directed set of VPERs, i.e., a nonempty set such that every pair of R_i, R_j have an upper bound R_k also in the set. Then we construct the least upper bound as:

$$(\bigsqcup_i R_i)(\Psi, M, N) \iff \exists i. R_i(\Psi, M, N)$$

This is symmetric because each R_i is. It is transitive because whenever $R_i(\Psi, M, N)$ and $R_j(\Psi, N, O)$, they have an upper bound R_k with $R_k(\Psi, M, N)$, $R_k(\Psi, N, O)$, and thus $R_k(\Psi, M, O)$.

To see that it is an upper bound of $\{R_i\}_i$, first observe that by definition, $R_i \subseteq \bigsqcup_i R_i$. Then, assume $R_i(\Psi, M, M)$ and $(\bigsqcup_i R_i)(\Psi, M, N)$ (hence $R_j(\Psi, M, N)$ for some j). But R_i, R_j have an upper bound R_k where $R_k(\Psi, M, -) = R_j(\Psi, M, -) = R_i(\Psi, M, -)$, so in particular, $R_i(\Psi, M, N)$. Finally, let S be another upper bound of $\{R_i\}_i$, and show $\bigsqcup_i R_i \sqsubseteq S$. We have $\bigsqcup R_i \subseteq S$ because all $R_i \sqsubseteq S$ and so all $R_i \subseteq S$. Assume $(\bigsqcup_i R_i)(\Psi, M, M)$ (hence $R_i(\Psi, M, N)$ for some i); because $R_i \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_i R_i$ and $R_i \sqsubseteq S$, we have $R_i(\Psi, M, -) = (\bigsqcup_i R_i)(\Psi, M, -) = S(\Psi, M, -)$. □

Corollary 45. Every monotone operator on VPER has a least fixed point.

A proof of this corollary can be found in Davey and Priestley [2002, 8.22]. We proceed by using this fact to construct the least VPERs described in the sections on the booleans and the circle, which we will call $\mathbb{B}(\Psi, V, V')$ and $\mathbb{C}(\Psi, V, V')$, respectively. (Then, to be precise, a cubical type system *has booleans* if $\mathsf{bool} \approx^{\Psi} \mathsf{bool}$ for all Ψ, and $M \approx^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{bool}} N \iff \mathbb{B}(\Psi, M, N)$.)

Definition 46. For a VPER R, we define the derived relations:

1. $R^{\boxplus}(\Psi, M, N)$ iff for all $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$,
   (a) $M\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1$, $M_1\psi_2 \Downarrow M_2$, $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow M_{12}$,
   (b) $N\psi_1 \Downarrow N_1$, $N_1\psi_2 \Downarrow N_2$, $N\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow N_{12}$, and
   (c) $R(\Psi_2, -, -)$ relates all of M_2, M_{12}, N_2, N_{12}.
2. $R^{\boxplus}(\Psi \mid \Xi, M, N)$ iff for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ satisfying Ξ, $R^{\boxplus}(\Psi', M\psi, N\psi)$.

Then $\mathbb{B}$ is the least fixed point of the following monotone operator on VPERs:

$$\begin{aligned} F(R) = \{&(\Psi, \mathsf{true}, \mathsf{true}), (\Psi, \mathsf{false}, \mathsf{false})\} \\ &\cup \{(\Psi, \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^{\varepsilon}}), \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{x_i}}_{\mathsf{bool}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', O; \overrightarrow{y.P_i^{\varepsilon}})) \mid \\ &\quad r \neq r' \wedge R^{\boxplus}(\Psi, M, O) \wedge R^{\boxplus}((\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon, x_j = \varepsilon'), N_i^{\varepsilon}, N_j^{\varepsilon'}) \wedge \\ &\quad R^{\boxplus}((\Psi, y \mid x_i = \varepsilon), N_i^{\varepsilon}, P_i^{\varepsilon}) \wedge R^{\boxplus}((\Psi \mid x_i = \varepsilon), N_i^{\varepsilon}\langle r/y\rangle, M)\} \end{aligned}$$

This is monotone because whenever $R \sqsubseteq S$, $F(R) \subseteq F(S)$; and for any $(F(R))(\Psi, M, M)$, either $M = \mathsf{true}$ or $M = \mathsf{false}$ or $M = \mathsf{hcom}$, and in each case we can show that $(F(R))(\Psi, M, -) = (F(S))(\Psi, M, -)$. One can also check that this definition agrees with the earlier one. The construction of $\mathbb{C}$ proceeds similarly.

Now, let CTS denote the collection of cubical type systems, which we here denote (E, Φ) rather than $(\approx^{-}, \approx^{-})$. We define an approximation ordering $(E, \Phi) \sqsubseteq (E', \Phi')$ by

$$E \sqsubseteq E' \wedge \forall \Psi, A. \left(E(\Psi, A, A) \implies \left(\Phi(\Psi, A, -, -) = \Phi'(\Psi, A, -, -)\right)\right)$$

That is, the elements of E are elements of E' with the same equivalence classes, and are sent to the same PERs by Φ and Φ'.

Lemma 47. $(\mathsf{CTS}, \sqsubseteq)$ *is a complete partial order.*

Proof. The relation $\sqsubseteq$ is a partial order because $E \sqsubseteq E'$ is. The pair of empty relations is $\sqsubseteq$ all other CTSs. Given a directed set $\{(E_i, \Phi_i)\}_i$ of CTSs, the least upper bound is:

$$\bigsqcup_i (E_i, \Phi_i) = \left(\bigsqcup_i E_i, \{(\Psi, A, M, N) \mid \exists i. (E_i(\Psi, A, A) \wedge \Phi_i(\Psi, A, M, N))\} \right)$$

Because $\{(E_i, \Phi_i)\}_i$ is directed, for any j, k, Ψ, A where $E_j(\Psi, A, A)$ and $E_k(\Psi, A, A)$, we have $\Phi_j(\Psi, A, -, -) = \Phi_k(\Psi, A, -, -)$, so the second component is equal to all of these. One can verify that the above definition yields a least upper bound. □

Once again, every monotone operator on CTS therefore has a least fixed point.

For every closed or open judgment $\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi]$ defined in Section 3, we write $(E, \Phi) \models (\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi])$ to explicitly annotate that this judgment is meant relative to the cubical type system (E, Φ). We have defined $(E, \Phi) \sqsubseteq (E', \Phi')$ in order to ensure that $(E, \Phi) \models (\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi])$ implies $(E', \Phi') \models (\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi])$:

Lemma 48. *Whenever* $(E, \Phi) \sqsubseteq (E', \Phi')$,

1. *if* $(E, \Phi) \models (\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi])$, *then* $(E', \Phi') \models (\mathcal{J}\ [\Psi])$;
2. *if* $(E, \Phi) \models (A\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi])$, *then* $(E, \Phi) \models (A \doteq B\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi])$ *iff* $(E', \Phi') \models (A \doteq B\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi])$;
3. *if* $(E, \Phi) \models (M \in A\ [\Psi])$, *then* $(E, \Phi) \models (M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi])$ *iff* $(E', \Phi') \models (M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi])$; *and*
4. *if* $(E, \Phi) \models (A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi])$, *then* $(E, \Phi) \models (A \doteq B\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi])$ *iff* $(E', \Phi') \models (A \doteq B\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi])$.

Finally, we define the monotone operator $F(E, \Phi) = (E', \Phi')$ where

$$\begin{aligned}
E' = {} & \{(\Psi, \mathsf{bool}, \mathsf{bool})\} \\
& \cup \{(\Psi, \mathbb{S}^1, \mathbb{S}^1)\} \\
& \cup \{(\Psi, (a{:}A) \to B, (a{:}A') \to B') \mid \\
& \quad (E, \Phi) \models \big(A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]\big) \wedge (E, \Phi) \models \big(a : A \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]\big)\} \\
& \cup \{(\Psi, (a{:}A) \times B, (a{:}A') \times B') \mid \\
& \quad (E, \Phi) \models \big(A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]\big) \wedge (E, \Phi) \models \big(a : A \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]\big)\} \\
& \cup \{(\Psi, \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1), \mathsf{Id}_{x.A'}(P_0', P_1')) \mid \\
& \quad (E, \Phi) \models \big(A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x]\big) \wedge (E, \Phi) \models \big(P_\varepsilon \doteq P_\varepsilon' \in A\langle \varepsilon/x \rangle\ [\Psi]\big)\} \\
& \cup \{((\Psi, x), \mathsf{not}_x, \mathsf{not}_x) \mid (E, \Phi) \models (\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x])\} \\
\Phi' = {} & \{(\Psi, \mathsf{bool}, V, V') \mid \mathbb{B}(\Psi, V, V')\} \\
& \cup \{(\Psi, \mathbb{S}^1, V, V') \mid \mathbb{C}(\Psi, V, V')\} \\
& \cup \{(\Psi, (a{:}A) \to B, \lambda a.M, \lambda a.M') \mid (E, \Phi) \models \big(a : A \gg M \doteq M' \in B\ [\Psi]\big)\} \\
& \cup \{(\Psi, (a{:}A) \times B, \langle M, N \rangle, \langle M', N' \rangle) \mid \\
& \quad (E, \Phi) \models \big(M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi]\big) \wedge (E, \Phi) \models \big(N \doteq N' \in B[M/a]\ [\Psi]\big)\} \\
& \cup \{(\Psi, \mathsf{Id}_{x.A}(P_0, P_1), \langle x \rangle M, \langle x \rangle M') \mid \\
& \quad (E, \Phi) \models \big(M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi, x]\big) \wedge (E, \Phi) \models (M\langle \varepsilon/x \rangle \doteq P_\varepsilon \in A\langle \varepsilon/x \rangle\ [\Psi])\} \\
& \cup \{((\Psi, x), \mathsf{not}_x, \mathsf{notel}_x(M), \mathsf{notel}_x(M')) \mid (E, \Phi) \models \big(M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi, x]\big)\}
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 49. *F is monotone, and any fixed point of F has booleans, the circle, all dependent function types, all dependent pair types, all identification types, and the not_x type.*

Proof. Monotonicity follows directly from Lemma 48 by inspecting the definition of F.

Let (E, Φ) be a fixed point of F. (E, Φ) has booleans and the circle because every cubical type system in the image of F clearly does. Given that (E, Φ) has booleans, in order to show that it has the not_x type, we must show that $E((\Psi, x), \mathsf{not}_x, \mathsf{not}_x)$ and $\Phi((\Psi, x), \mathsf{not}_x, -, -)$ is the least relation relating $\mathsf{notel}_x(M)$ and $\mathsf{notel}_x(M')$ when $(E, \Phi) \models (M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{bool}\ [\Psi, x])$. These follow by $(E, \Phi) \models (\mathsf{bool}\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x])$, $(E, \Phi) = F(E, \Phi)$, and the definition of F.

Assume $(E, \Phi) \models (A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi])$ and $(E, \Phi) \models (a : A \gg B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi])$; we want to show that (E, Φ) has their dependent function type. For all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $(E, \Phi) \models (A\psi \doteq A'\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'])$ and $(E, \Phi) \models (a : A\psi \gg B\psi \doteq B'\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'])$. Because $(E, \Phi) = F(E, \Phi)$, by the definition of F, $E(\Psi', (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi, (a{:}A'\psi) \to B'\psi)$ and $\Phi(\Psi', (a{:}A\psi) \to B\psi, -, -)$ is the least relation relating $\lambda a.M$ and $\lambda a.M'$ when $(E, \Phi) \models (a : A\psi \gg M \doteq M' \in B\psi\ [\Psi'])$. The argument for dependent pair types and identification types is similar. □

It follows that F has a least fixed point (E, Φ) which validates the rules we have given in Section 5. However, by Lemma 48, any judgments that hold in (E, Φ) also hold in any larger cubical type system $(E, \Phi) \sqsubseteq (E', \Phi')$.

A.3 Additional lemmas

Here we prove a number of general-purpose lemmas omitted in Section 3.3.

Lemma 50. *If $A \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ and A is cubical, then B is cubical.*

Proof. For any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{B_0} N$ for $B\psi \Downarrow B_0$, show that $M \doteq N \in B\psi\ [\Psi']$. But $A\psi \Downarrow A_0 \approx^{\Psi'} B_0$ so $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{A_0} N$; by A cubical we have $M \doteq N \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$; and the result follows by Lemma 29. □

The following lemmas are variations on head expansion (Lemma 24).

Lemma 51. *Assume we have M tm $[\Psi]$, A $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$, and a family of terms $\{M^{\Psi'}_\psi\}_{\psi:\Psi'\to\Psi}$ such that for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $M^{\Psi'}_\psi \doteq (M^\Psi_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi})\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$ and $M\psi \longmapsto^* M^{\Psi'}_\psi$. Then $M \doteq M^\Psi_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi} \in A\ [\Psi]$.*

Proof. For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, we must show that $M_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} (M^\Psi_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi})\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M'_1\psi_2$ where $M\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1$ and $(M^\Psi_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi})\psi_1 \Downarrow M'_1$.

1. $M_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M\psi_1\psi_2$.

   We know $M\psi_1 \longmapsto^* M^{\Psi_1}_{\psi_1}$ and $M^{\Psi_1}_{\psi_1} \in A\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$, so $M^{\Psi_1}_{\psi_1} \Downarrow M_1$ and $M_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} (M^{\Psi_1}_{\psi_1})\psi_2$. By $M^{\Psi_1}_{\psi_1} \doteq (M^\Psi_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi})\psi_1 \in A\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$ under ψ_2, $(M^\Psi_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi})\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq M^{\Psi_2}_{\psi_1\psi_2} \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$, and transitivity, we have $(M^{\Psi_1}_{\psi_1})\psi_2 \doteq M^{\Psi_2}_{\psi_1\psi_2} \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$ and thus $(M^{\Psi_1}_{\psi_1})\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M^{\Psi_2}_{\psi_1\psi_2}$. The result $M\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* M^{\Psi_2}_{\psi_1\psi_2} \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M_1\psi_2$ follows.

2. $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} (M^\Psi_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi})\psi_1\psi_2$.

   Follows from $M\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* M^{\Psi_2}_{\psi_1\psi_2} \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} (M^\Psi_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi})\psi_1\psi_2$, by $M^{\Psi_2}_{\psi_1\psi_2} \doteq (M^\Psi_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi})\psi_1\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$.

3. $(M^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi})\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M'_1\psi_2$.

   Follows from $M^{\Psi}_{\mathsf{id}_\Psi} \in A\ [\Psi]$. □

Lemma 24 is a special case of the above, in which $M^{\Psi'}_{\psi} = M'\psi$.

Lemma 52. *If $A' \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ and for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $A\psi \longmapsto^* A'\psi$, then $A \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$.*

Proof. For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$, we know $A'\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A'_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} B\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} B_1\psi_2$ where $A'\psi_1 \Downarrow A_1$ and $B\psi_1 \Downarrow B_1$. It remains to show $A'\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A\psi_1\psi_2$ and $A'_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A_1\psi_2$ where $A\psi_1 \Downarrow A_1$. The former holds by $A\psi_1\psi_2 \longmapsto^* A'\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A'\psi_1\psi_2$. The latter holds because $A\psi_1 \longmapsto^* A'\psi_1 \Downarrow A'_1$; thus $A_1 = A'_1$, and the result follows by $A'_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A'_1\psi_2$. □

Lemma 53. *If $A' \doteq B$ type $[\Psi]$ and for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $A\psi \longmapsto^* A'\psi$, then $A \doteq B$ type $[\Psi]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 52, $A \doteq A'$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ and $A \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$. By the former and Lemma 50, A is cubical. Thus it suffices to show that A and B are equally Kan. We outline the arguments for the hcom and coe conditions separately.

In the first Kan condition, we are given elements $- \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$ and must show $\mathsf{hcom}_{A\psi} \doteq \mathsf{hcom}_{B\psi} \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$. The given elements are $- \in A'\psi\ [\Psi']$ also, so by $A' \doteq B$ type $[\Psi]$, $\mathsf{hcom}_{A'\psi} \doteq \mathsf{hcom}_{B\psi} \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$. The result follows by Lemma 24 on the left, since for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, $\mathsf{hcom}_{A\psi\psi'} \longmapsto^* \mathsf{hcom}_{A'\psi\psi'}$. The second and third Kan conditions follow similarly.

In the fourth Kan condition, we are given elements $- \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$ and must show $\mathsf{coe}_{x.A\psi} \doteq \mathsf{coe}_{x.B\psi} \in A\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$. The given elements are $- \in A'\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$ also, so by $A' \doteq B$ type $[\Psi]$, $\mathsf{coe}_{x.A'\psi} \doteq \mathsf{coe}_{x.B\psi} \in A\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$. The result follows by Lemma 24 on the left, since for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, $\mathsf{coe}_{x.A\psi\psi'} \longmapsto^* \mathsf{coe}_{x.A'\psi\psi'}$. The fifth Kan condition follows similarly. □

Next, we prove a strengthened form of Lemma 25 for cubical pretypes.

Lemma 54. *If A $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ is cubical, $M \in A\ [\Psi]$, $N \in A\ [\Psi]$, and $M \sim^{\Psi}_{A} N$, then $M \doteq N \in A\ [\Psi]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 25, it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{A\psi} N\psi$. By $M \in A\ [\Psi]$, we know that $M\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{A\psi} M_0\psi$ where $M \Downarrow M_0$, and similarly for N. By A $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ cubical and $M_0 \approx^{\Psi}_{A_0} N_0$, we know that $M_0 \doteq N_0 \in A\ [\Psi]$, and thus, $M_0\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{A\psi} N_0\psi$. The result follows by transitivity. □

Lemma 55. *If A $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ is cubical and $M \in A\ [\Psi]$, then $M \Downarrow V$ and $M \doteq V \in A\ [\Psi]$.*

Proof. By $M \in A\ [\Psi]$, $M \Downarrow V$ and $V \approx^{\Psi}_{A_0} V$ where $A \Downarrow A_0$. Because A $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ is cubical, $V \in A\ [\Psi]$. The result follows by Lemma 54. □

A.4 Univalence for isomorphisms

Extend the term syntax by $\mathsf{ia}_r(A, B, F, G)$, $\mathsf{iain}_r(M, F)$, and $\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G)$, and the operational semantics by

$$\overline{\mathsf{ia}_x(A, B, F, G)\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \overline{\mathsf{ia}_0(A, B, F, G) \longmapsto A} \qquad \overline{\mathsf{ia}_1(A, B, F, G) \longmapsto B}$$

$$\overline{\mathsf{iain}_x(M, F)\ \mathsf{val}} \qquad \overline{\mathsf{iain}_0(M, F) \longmapsto M} \qquad \overline{\mathsf{iain}_1(M, F) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(F, M)}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{iaout}_0(M,G) \longmapsto M} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{iaout}_1(M,G) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(G,M)}$$

$$\frac{M \longmapsto M'}{\mathsf{iaout}_x(M,G) \longmapsto \mathsf{iaout}_x(M',G)} \qquad \frac{}{\mathsf{iaout}_x(\mathsf{iain}_x(M,F),G) \longmapsto M}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{ia}_x(A,B,F,G)}(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{iain}_{r'}(\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A}(\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G\langle r/x\rangle)), F\langle r'/x\rangle)}$$

$$\frac{w \neq x \quad C = \mathsf{com}^w_{x.A}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{iaout}_w(M, G\langle r/x\rangle); y.\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow y}_{x.A}(M), y.\mathsf{app}(G\langle y/x\rangle, \mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow y}_{x.B}(M)))}{\mathsf{coe}^{r \rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{ia}_w(A,B,F,G)}(M) \longmapsto \mathsf{iain}_w(C, F\langle r'/x\rangle)}$$

$$\frac{\overrightarrow{T} = \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{iaout}_x(N^\varepsilon_i, G)}, z.\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_A(r \rightsquigarrow z, M; \overrightarrow{y.N^\varepsilon_i}), z.\mathsf{app}(G, \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_B(r \rightsquigarrow z, M; \overrightarrow{y.N^\varepsilon_i}))}{\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{ia}_x(A,B,F,G)}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N^\varepsilon_i}) \longmapsto \mathsf{iain}_x(\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}, x}_A(r \rightsquigarrow r', \mathsf{iaout}_x(M,G); \overrightarrow{T}), F)}$$

If a cubical type system has dependent function types,

1. $A \doteq A'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$,
2. $B \doteq B'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]$,
3. $F \doteq F' \in A \to B\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]$,
4. $G \doteq G' \in B \to A\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]$,
5. $a : A \gg \mathsf{app}(G, \mathsf{app}(F, a)) \doteq a \in A\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]$, and
6. $b : B \gg \mathsf{app}(F, \mathsf{app}(G, b)) \doteq b \in B\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]$,

we say it has their *isomorphism-univalence type* when for all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ such that $r\psi = x$, $\mathsf{ia}_x(A\psi, B\psi, F\psi, G\psi) \approx^{\Psi'} \mathsf{ia}_x(A'\psi, B'\psi, F'\psi, G'\psi)$, and $- \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{ia}_x(A\psi,B\psi,F\psi,G\psi)} -$ is the least relation such that

$$\mathsf{iain}_x(M, F'') \approx^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{ia}_x(A\psi,B\psi,F\psi,G\psi)} \mathsf{iain}_x(M', F''')$$

when $M \doteq M' \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$, $F\psi \doteq F'' \in A\psi \to B\psi\ [\Psi' \mid x = 1]$, and $F\psi \doteq F''' \in A\psi \to B\psi\ [\Psi' \mid x = 1]$.

We will abbreviate the six premises above as $\mathsf{Iso}_r(A, B, F, G) \doteq \mathsf{Iso}_r(A', B', F', G')\ [\Psi]$, and abbreviate the unary version $\mathsf{Iso}_r(A, B, F, G)\ [\Psi]$. Note that if $r = 0, 1$ the condition of having the isomorphism-univalence type is trivial. In the remainder of this subsection, we consider cubical type systems that have dependent function types and the isomorphism-univalence type of $\mathsf{Iso}_r(A, B, F, G) \doteq \mathsf{Iso}_r(A', B', F', G')\ [\Psi]$.

Isomorphism-univalence types generalize not_x, which constructs an x-line between bool and bool corresponding to the isomorphism $\mathsf{not}(-)$. In contrast, $\mathsf{ia}_x(A, B, F, G)$ constructs an x-line between $A\langle 0/x\rangle$ and $B\langle 1/x\rangle$, given an x-line A and any (strict) isomorphism between $A\langle 1/x\rangle$ and $B\langle 1/x\rangle$.



Coercion from 0 to 1 is implemented by coercing in A, then applying the forward direction of the isomorphism. Analogously to not_x, the canonical elements of $\mathsf{ia}_x(A, B, F, G)$ are $\mathsf{iain}_x(M, F)$ where $M \in A\ [\Psi]$; computing the right face of such an element applies the isomorphism, but computing the left face does not. (The opposite is the case with not_x.) Modulo implementation details, however, one may simply replace the type not_x with $\mathsf{ia}_x(\mathsf{bool}, \mathsf{bool}, \lambda a.\mathsf{not}(a), \lambda a.\mathsf{not}(a))$.

A crucial difference between these constructions is that A may have non-trivial coercion, unlike bool, making it impossible to extract M from $\mathsf{iain}_x(M, F)$ by applying coe as in Lemma 42. Instead, we provide $\mathsf{iaout}_x(M, G)$ for this explicit purpose.

Pretype $\mathsf{ia}_r(A, B, F, G) \doteq \mathsf{ia}_r(A', B', F', G')\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$. If $r = 0$ then $\mathsf{ia}_0(A, B, F, G) \doteq A\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$, and if $r = 1$ then $\mathsf{ia}_1(A, B, F, G) \doteq B\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$.

Here and in future proofs, we will abbreviate the arguments to $\mathsf{ia}_r(-)$ by I when clear. We focus on the unary case. For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$,

1. If $r\psi_1 = 0$ then by $A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, we have $\mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi_1) \longmapsto A\psi_1 \Downarrow A_1$ and $A_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A\psi_1\psi_2$.
2. If $r\psi_1 = 1$ then by $B\psi_1\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi_1]$, we have $\mathsf{ia}_1(I\psi_1) \longmapsto B\psi_1 \Downarrow B_1$ and $B_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} B\psi_1\psi_2$.
3. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = 0$ then $\mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi_1)\ \mathsf{val}$, and by $A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$ we have $\mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto A\psi_1\psi_2$, $\mathsf{ia}_{r\psi_1\psi_2}(I\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto A\psi_1\psi_2$, and $A\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} A\psi_1\psi_2$.
4. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = 1$ then $\mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi_1)\ \mathsf{val}$, and by $B\psi_1\psi_2\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi_2]$ we have $\mathsf{ia}_1(I\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto B\psi_1\psi_2$, $\mathsf{ia}_{r\psi_1\psi_2}(I\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto B\psi_1\psi_2$, and $B\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2} B\psi_1\psi_2$.
5. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = x'$ then $\mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi_1)\ \mathsf{val}$, $\mathsf{ia}_{x'}(I\psi_1\psi_2)\ \mathsf{val}$, and by assumption, $\mathsf{ia}_{x'}(I\psi_1\psi_2) \approx^{\Psi_2} \mathsf{ia}_{x'}(I\psi_1\psi_2)$.

The equations hold because for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi) \longmapsto A\psi$ where $A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]$, and $\mathsf{ia}_1(I\psi) \longmapsto B\psi$ where $B\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi \mid 1 = 1]$.

Introduction If $M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi]$ then $\mathsf{iain}_r(M, F) \doteq \mathsf{iain}_r(M', F') \in \mathsf{ia}_r(A, B, F, G)\ [\Psi]$. If $r = 0$ then $\mathsf{iain}_0(M, F) \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]$, and if $r = 1$ then $\mathsf{iain}_1(M, F) \doteq \mathsf{app}(F, M) \in B\ [\Psi]$.

For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$,

1. If $r\psi_1 = 0$ then by $M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi]$, we know that $\mathsf{iain}_0(M\psi_1, F\psi_1) \longmapsto M\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1$, $\mathsf{iain}_0(M\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$, and $M_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M\psi_1\psi_2$ (and similarly for $\mathsf{iain}_r(M', F')$).
2. If $r\psi_1 = 1$ then $\mathsf{app}(F\psi_1, M\psi_1) \doteq \mathsf{app}(F'\psi_1, M'\psi_1) \in B\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$ by the elimination rule for dependent functions, so we know that $\mathsf{iain}_1(M\psi_1, F\psi_1) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(F\psi_1, M\psi_1) \Downarrow N_1$ and $\mathsf{iain}_1(M\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(F\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{B\psi_1\psi_2} N_1\psi_2$ (and similarly for $\mathsf{iain}_r(M', F')$).
3. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = 0$ then $\mathsf{iain}_x(M\psi_1, F\psi_1)\ \mathsf{val}$, and by $M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi]$ we have $\mathsf{iain}_0(M\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M\psi_1\psi_2$ (and similarly for $\mathsf{iain}_r(M', F')$).
4. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = 1$ then $\mathsf{iain}_x(M\psi_1, F\psi_1)\ \mathsf{val}$, and by
$$\mathsf{app}(F\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2) \doteq \mathsf{app}(F'\psi_1\psi_2, M'\psi_1\psi_2) \in B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$$
we have $\mathsf{iain}_1(M\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(F\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{B\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{app}(F\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2)$ (and similarly for $\mathsf{iain}_r(M', F')$).

5. If $r\psi_1 = x$ and $x\psi_2 = x'$ then $\mathsf{iain}_x(M\psi_1, F\psi_1)$ val and $\mathsf{iain}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2)$ val. To see

$$\mathsf{iain}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2, F\psi_1\psi_2) \approx^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{ia}_{x'}(I\psi_1\psi_2)} \mathsf{iain}_{x'}(M'\psi_1\psi_2, F'\psi_1\psi_2)$$

notice that $M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq M'\psi_1\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$ and by Lemma 31, we have $F\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq F'\psi_1\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2 \to B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2 \mid x' = 1]$.

The first equation holds by Lemma 24 and our hypothesis; the second holds by these and the elimination rule for dependent functions.

Cubical For any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$ and $M \approx^{\Psi'}_{I_0} N$ where $\mathsf{ia}_{r\psi}(I\psi) \Downarrow I_0$, $M \doteq N \in \mathsf{ia}_{r\psi}(I\psi)\ [\Psi']$.

If $r\psi = 0$ then this follows from $\mathsf{ia}_{r\psi}(I\psi) \doteq A\psi$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi']$ and the fact that A $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi]$ is cubical; and similarly when $r\psi = 1$. If $r\psi = x$ then this follows from the introduction rule.

Elimination If $M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{ia}_r(A, B, F, G)\ [\Psi]$ then $\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_r(M', G') \in A\ [\Psi]$. If $r = 0$ then $\mathsf{iaout}_0(M, G) \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]$, and if $r = 1$ then $\mathsf{iaout}_1(M, G) \doteq \mathsf{app}(G, M) \in A\ [\Psi]$.

We focus on the unary case. For any $\psi_1 : \Psi_1 \to \Psi$ and $\psi_2 : \Psi_2 \to \Psi_1$,

1. If $r\psi_1 = 0$ then by $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi_1)\ [\Psi_1]$ and $\mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi_1) \doteq A\psi_1$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi_1]$, $\mathsf{iaout}_0(M\psi_1, G\psi_1) \longmapsto M\psi_1 \Downarrow M_1$ and $\mathsf{iaout}_0(M\psi_1\psi_2, G\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} M_1\psi_2$.

2. If $r\psi_1 = 1$ then by $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{ia}_1(I\psi_1)\ [\Psi_1]$, $\mathsf{ia}_1(I\psi_1) \doteq B\psi_1$ $\mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi_1]$, $G\psi_1 \in B\psi_1 \to A\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$, and the elimination rule for dependent functions, we have $\mathsf{app}(G\psi_1, M\psi_1) \in A\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$. Thus $\mathsf{iaout}_1(M\psi_1, G\psi_1) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(G\psi_1, M\psi_1) \Downarrow N_1$ and

$$\mathsf{iaout}_1(M\psi_1\psi_2, G\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(G\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N_1\psi_2.$$

3. If $r\psi_1 = x$ then $M\psi_1 \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi_1)\ [\Psi_1]$, so $M\psi_1 \Downarrow \mathsf{iain}_x(N, H)$ where $N \in A\psi_1\ [\Psi_1]$ and $F\psi_1 \doteq H \in A\psi_1 \to B\psi_1\ [\Psi_1 \mid x = 1]$. Thus $\mathsf{iaout}_x(M\psi_1, G\psi_1) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{iaout}_x(\mathsf{iain}_x(N, H), G\psi_1) \longmapsto N \Downarrow N_0$.

   (a) If $x\psi_2 = 0$ then $\mathsf{iaout}_0(M\psi_1\psi_2, G\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto M\psi_1\psi_2$ and we must show $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N_0\psi_2$. This follows from $\mathsf{iain}_0(N\psi_2, H\psi_2) \longmapsto N\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{\mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi_1\psi_2)} M\psi_1\psi_2$, $\mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto A\psi_1\psi_2$, and $N\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N_0\psi_2$.

   (b) If $x\psi_2 = 1$ then $\mathsf{iaout}_1(M\psi_1\psi_2, G\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(G\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2)$ and we must show $\mathsf{app}(G\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N_0\psi_2$. By $N\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N_0\psi_2$, we instead show that $\mathsf{app}(G\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2) \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N\psi_2$.

   For all $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi_2$, $M\psi_1\psi_2\psi \sim^{\Psi'}_{B\psi_1\psi_2\psi} \mathsf{iain}_1(N\psi_2\psi, H\psi_2\psi) \longmapsto \mathsf{app}(H\psi_2\psi, N\psi_2\psi)$, so by Lemma 25, $M\psi_1\psi_2 \in B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$, and $\mathsf{app}(H\psi_2, N\psi_2) \in B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$, we have

$$M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq \mathsf{app}(H\psi_2, N\psi_2) \in B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2].$$

   By the elimination rule for dependent functions and $F\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq H\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2 \to B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$,

$$M\psi_1\psi_2 \doteq \mathsf{app}(F\psi_1\psi_2, N\psi_2) \in B\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2],$$

and by the elimination rule for dependent functions and the hypothesis that $a : A\psi_1\psi_2 \gg \mathsf{app}(G\psi_1\psi_2, \mathsf{app}(F\psi_1\psi_2, a)) \doteq a \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$,

$$\mathsf{app}(G\psi_1\psi_2, M\psi_1\psi_2) \doteq N\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2].$$

The result follows immediately.

(c) If $x\psi_2 = x'$ then $M\psi_1\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} \mathsf{iain}_{x'}(N\psi_2, H\psi_2)$, so $M\psi_1\psi_2 \Downarrow \mathsf{iain}_{x'}(N', H')$ and $N' \doteq N\psi_2 \in A\psi_1\psi_2\ [\Psi_2]$. Thus $\mathsf{iaout}_{x'}(M\psi_1\psi_2, G\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto^* \mathsf{iaout}_{x'}(\mathsf{iain}_{x'}(N', H'), G\psi_1\psi_2) \longmapsto N'$, and we must show $N' \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N_0\psi_2$. But this follows from $N' \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N\psi_2$ and $N\psi_2 \sim^{\Psi_2}_{A\psi_1\psi_2} N_0\psi_2$.

Once again the equations hold by Lemma 24 and the elimination rule for dependent functions.

Computation If $M \in A\ [\Psi]$ then $\mathsf{iaout}_r(\mathsf{iain}_r(M, F), G) \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]$.

By Lemma 25 and the introduction and elimination rules we have just proven, it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathsf{iaout}_{r\psi}(\mathsf{iain}_{r\psi}(M\psi, F\psi), G\psi) \sim^{\Psi'}_{A\psi} M\psi$.

1. If $r\psi = 0$ then $\mathsf{iaout}_0(\mathsf{iain}_0(M\psi, F\psi), G\psi) \longmapsto^* M\psi$ and the result follows by $M \in A\ [\Psi]$.

2. If $r\psi = 1$ then by the equations in the introduction and elimination rules,

$$\mathsf{iaout}_1(\mathsf{iain}_1(M\psi, F\psi), G\psi) \doteq \mathsf{app}(G\psi, \mathsf{app}(F\psi, M\psi)) \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$$

and by $a : A \gg \mathsf{app}(G, \mathsf{app}(F, a)) \doteq a \in A\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]$ we have $\mathsf{app}(G\psi, \mathsf{app}(F\psi, M\psi)) \doteq M\psi \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$. The result follows immediately.

3. If $r\psi = x$ then $\mathsf{iaout}_x(\mathsf{iain}_x(M\psi, F\psi), G\psi) \longmapsto M\psi$ and the result follows by $M \in A\ [\Psi]$.

Eta If $M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(A, B, F, G)\ [\Psi]$ then $\mathsf{iain}_r(\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G), F) \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(A, B, F, G)\ [\Psi]$.

By Lemma 25 and the introduction and elimination rules we have just proven, it suffices to show that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, $\mathsf{iain}_{r\psi}(\mathsf{iaout}_{r\psi}(M\psi, F\psi), G\psi) \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{ia}_{r\psi}(I\psi)} M\psi$.

1. If $r\psi = 0$ then $\mathsf{iain}_0(\mathsf{iaout}_0(M\psi, G\psi), F\psi) \longmapsto^* M\psi$ and the result follows by $M \in A\ [\Psi]$.

2. If $r\psi = 1$ then by the equations in the introduction and elimination rules,

$$\mathsf{iain}_1(\mathsf{iaout}_1(M\psi, G\psi), F\psi) \doteq \mathsf{app}(F\psi, \mathsf{app}(G\psi, M\psi)) \in B\psi\ [\Psi']$$

and by assumption, $\mathsf{app}(F\psi, \mathsf{app}(G\psi, M\psi)) \doteq M\psi \in B\psi\ [\Psi']$. The result follows immediately.

3. If $r\psi = x$ then $M\psi \Downarrow \mathsf{iain}_x(N, F'')$ where $N \in A\psi\ [\Psi']$ and $F'' \doteq F\psi \in A\psi \to B\psi\ [\Psi' \mid x = 1]$. By Lemma 55, since $\mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi']$ is cubical, $M\psi \doteq \mathsf{iain}_x(N, F'') \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)\ [\Psi']$. By the equations in the introduction and elimination rules,

$$\mathsf{iain}_x(\mathsf{iaout}_x(M\psi, G\psi), F\psi) \doteq \mathsf{iain}_x(\mathsf{iaout}_x(\mathsf{iain}_x(N, F\psi), G\psi), F'') \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)\ [\Psi'].$$

By the computation rule, the right-hand side is $- \doteq \mathsf{iain}_x(N, F'') \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)\ [\Psi']$, and so the result $\mathsf{iain}_x(\mathsf{iaout}_x(M\psi, G\psi), F\psi) \sim^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)} M\psi$ follows.

Kan $\mathsf{ia}_r(I) \doteq \mathsf{ia}_r(I')$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ are equally Kan; if $r = 0$, $\mathsf{ia}_0(I) \doteq A$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ are equally Kan; and if $r = 1$, $\mathsf{ia}_1(I) \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ are equally Kan.

The latter two equations hold by Lemma 53, because when $r = 0$, $\mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi) \longmapsto A\psi$ and A type $[\Psi]$, and when $r = 1$, $\mathsf{ia}_1(I\psi) \longmapsto B\psi$ and B type $[\Psi \mid 1 = 1]$.

The first Kan condition (in its unary form) requires that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, if

1. $M \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)$ $[\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)$ $[\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ for any $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)$ $[\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ for any i, ε,

then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)$ $[\Psi']$.

If $r''\psi = \varepsilon$ then this follows from the fact that $\mathsf{ia}_0(I) \doteq A$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{ia}_1(I) \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ are equally Kan. If $r''\psi = x$, we appeal to Lemma 51 with

$$\{X^{\Psi''}_{\psi'}\}_{\psi':\Psi''\to\Psi'} = \begin{cases} \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{A\psi\psi'}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}) & \text{if } x\psi' = 0 \\ \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{B\psi\psi'}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}) & \text{if } x\psi' = 1 \\ \mathsf{iain}_{x'}(\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'},x'}_{A\psi\psi'}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', \mathsf{iaout}_{x'}(M\psi', G\psi\psi'); \overrightarrow{T}), F\psi\psi') & \text{if } x\psi' = x' \end{cases}$$

$$\overrightarrow{T} = \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{iaout}_{x'}(N_i^\varepsilon\psi', G\psi\psi')}, z.\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{A\psi\psi'}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow z, M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}), z.\mathsf{app}(G\psi\psi', \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}_{B\psi\psi'}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow z, M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}))$$

We begin by showing the following result, which states the well-formedness of the Kan composition in $X^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}}$; it is the core of the argument that the first three Kan conditions for $\mathsf{ia}_r(I)$ hold.

Lemma 56. *If* $\mathsf{Iso}_x(I\psi)$ $[\Psi']$,

1. $M \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)$ $[\Psi']$,
2. $N_i^\varepsilon \doteq N_j^{\varepsilon'} \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)$ $[\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ *for any* $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, *and*
3. $N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)$ $[\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ *for any* i, ε,

then

1. $\mathsf{iaout}_x(M, G\psi) \in A\psi$ $[\Psi']$,
2. $\mathsf{iaout}_x(N_i^\varepsilon, G\psi) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_x(N_j^{\varepsilon'}, G\psi) \in A\psi$ $[\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, r_j = \varepsilon']$ *for any* $i, j, \varepsilon, \varepsilon'$,
3. $\mathsf{iaout}_x(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r/y\rangle, G\psi) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_x(M, G\psi) \in A\psi$ $[\Psi' \mid r_i = \varepsilon]$ *for any* i, ε,
4. $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow y, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \in A\psi$ $[\Psi', y \mid x = 0]$,
5. $\mathsf{app}(G\psi, \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{B\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow y, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})) \in A\psi$ $[\Psi', y \mid x = 1]$,
6. $\mathsf{iaout}_x(N_i^\varepsilon, G\psi) \doteq \mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow y, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \in A\psi$ $[\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, x = 0]$ *for any* i, ε,

7. $\mathsf{iaout}_x(N_i^\varepsilon, G\psi) \doteq \mathsf{app}(G\psi, \mathsf{hcom}_{B\psi}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow y, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})) \in A\psi\ [\Psi', y \mid r_i = \varepsilon, x = 1]$ *for any* i, ε,

8. $\mathsf{hcom}_{A\psi}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_x(M, G\psi) \in A\psi\ [\Psi' \mid x = 0]$, *and*

9. $\mathsf{app}(G\psi, \mathsf{hcom}_{B\psi}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon})) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_x(M, G\psi) \in A\psi\ [\Psi' \mid x = 1]$.

Proof.

1-3. These follow by the elimination rule.

4. Show that for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to (\Psi', y)$ satisfying $x = 0$, $\mathsf{hcom}_{A\psi\psi'}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow y\psi', M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}) \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$. The result follows by the first Kan condition of $A\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$, because $\mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi\psi') \doteq A\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi'']$.

5. As in the previous case, for any $\psi' : \Psi'' \to (\Psi', y)$ satisfying $x = 1$, $\mathsf{hcom}_{B\psi\psi'} \in B\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$. The result follows by $G\psi\psi' \in B\psi\psi' \to A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$ and the elimination rule for dependent functions.

6. Under any satisfying ψ', the left-hand side is equal to $N_i^\varepsilon\psi'$ by the elimination rule, and the right-hand side is equal to $N_i^\varepsilon\psi'\langle y\psi'/y\psi'\rangle$ by the third Kan condition of $A\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$.

7. Under any satisfying ψ', the left-hand side is equal to $\mathsf{app}(G\psi\psi', N_i^\varepsilon\psi')$ by the elimination rule, and the right-hand side is equal to $\mathsf{app}(G\psi\psi', N_i^\varepsilon\psi'\langle y\psi'/y\psi'\rangle)$ by the elimination rule for dependent functions and the third Kan condition of $B\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$.

8. Under any satisfying ψ', the left-hand side is equal to $M\psi'$ by the second Kan condition of $A\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$, and the right-hand side is equal to $M\psi'$ by the elimination rule.

9. Under any satisfying ψ', the left-hand side is equal to $\mathsf{app}(G\psi\psi', M\psi')$ by the elimination rule for dependent functions and the second Kan condition of $B\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$, and the right-hand side is equal to $\mathsf{app}(G\psi\psi', M\psi')$ by the elimination rule. □

We now show that for all $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, $X_{\psi'}^{\Psi''} \doteq (X_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}}^{\Psi'})\psi' \in \mathsf{ia}_{x\psi'}(I\psi\psi')\ [\Psi'']$, from which it follows that $\mathsf{hcom}_{\mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq X_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}}^{\Psi'} \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)\ [\Psi']$. This completes the proof of the first Kan condition (including the binary case, which follows by transitivity).

1. $x\psi' = 0$.

   By the introduction rule, Lemma 56, and the third Kan condition of $A\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$,

   $$(X_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}}^{\Psi'})\psi' \doteq \mathsf{hcom}_{A\psi\psi'}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}) \in A\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$$

   which, by $A\psi\psi' \doteq \mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi\psi')\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi'']$, completes this case.

2. $x\psi' = 1$.

   By the introduction rule, Lemma 56, and the third Kan condition of $A\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$,

   $$(X_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}}^{\Psi'})\psi' \doteq \mathsf{app}(F\psi\psi', \mathsf{app}(G\psi\psi', \mathsf{hcom}_{B\psi\psi'}^{\overrightarrow{r_i\psi'}}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', M\psi'; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon\psi'}))) \in B\psi\psi'\ [\Psi''].$$

   The result follows by the first Kan condition of $B\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'']$, $B\psi\psi' \doteq \mathsf{ia}_1(I\psi\psi')\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi'']$, and $b : B\psi\psi' \gg \mathsf{app}(F\psi\psi', \mathsf{app}(G\psi\psi', b)) \doteq b \in B\psi\psi'\ [\Psi'']$.

3. $x\psi' = x'$.

   Immediate by the introduction rule, Lemma 56, and the first Kan condition of $A\psi\psi'$ type $[\Psi'']$.

The second Kan condition requires that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, under the same hypotheses as before, if $r = r'$, then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)}(r \rightsquigarrow r, M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)$ $[\Psi']$.

If $r''\psi = \varepsilon$ then this follows from the fact that $\mathsf{ia}_0(I) \doteq A$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{ia}_1(I) \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ are equally Kan. If $r''\psi = x$ then we have already shown that the left-hand side

$$- \doteq \mathsf{iain}_x(\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i},x}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, \mathsf{iaout}_x(M, G\psi); \dots), F\psi) \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)\ [\Psi'].$$

By the introduction rule, Lemma 56, and the second Kan condition of $A\psi$ type $[\Psi']$, the above is

$$- \doteq \mathsf{iain}_x(\mathsf{iaout}_x(M, G\psi), F\psi) \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)\ [\Psi']$$

which by the eta rule $- \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)$ $[\Psi']$.

The third Kan condition requires that for any $\psi : \Psi' \to \Psi$, under the same hypotheses as before, if $r_i = \varepsilon$, then $\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i}}_{\mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)}(r \rightsquigarrow r', M; \overrightarrow{y.N_i^\varepsilon}) \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)$ $[\Psi']$.

If $r''\psi = \varepsilon$ then this follows from the fact that $\mathsf{ia}_0(I) \doteq A$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ and $\mathsf{ia}_1(I) \doteq B$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi]$ are equally Kan. If $r''\psi = x$ then we have already shown that the left-hand side

$$- \doteq \mathsf{iain}_x(\mathsf{hcom}^{\overrightarrow{r_i},x}_{A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r', \dots; \overrightarrow{y.\mathsf{iaout}_x(N_i^\varepsilon, G\psi)}, z.\dots., z.\dots.), F\psi) \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)\ [\Psi'].$$

By the introduction rule, Lemma 56, and the third Kan condition of $A\psi$ type $[\Psi']$, the above is

$$- \doteq \mathsf{iain}_x(\mathsf{iaout}_x(N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle, G\psi), F\psi) \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)\ [\Psi']$$

which by the eta rule $- \doteq N_i^\varepsilon\langle r'/y\rangle \in \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)$ $[\Psi']$.

The fourth Kan condition (in its unary form) requires that for any $\psi : (\Psi', x) \to \Psi$, if $M \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi\langle r/x\rangle}(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)$ $[\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)}(M) \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi\langle r'/x\rangle}(I\psi\langle r'/x\rangle)$ $[\Psi']$.

There are three cases. If $r''\psi = \varepsilon$ then this follows from the fact that $\mathsf{ia}_\varepsilon(I\psi)$ $\mathsf{pretype}$ $[\Psi']$ and $A\psi$ or $B\psi$ (depending on ε) are equally Kan. If $r''\psi = x$ then we know $M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)$ $[\Psi']$ and must show $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)}(M) \in \mathsf{ia}_{r'}(I\psi\langle r'/x\rangle)$ $[\Psi']$. By Lemma 24 it suffices to show

$$\mathsf{iain}_{r'}(\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle)), F\psi\langle r'/x\rangle) \in \mathsf{ia}_{r'}(I\psi\langle r'/x\rangle)\ [\Psi'].$$

In this case we know $\mathsf{lso}_x(I\psi)$ $[\Psi', x]$, so $\mathsf{lso}_r(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)$ $[\Psi']$, and by the elimination rule and $M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)$ $[\Psi']$, we have $\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle$ $[\Psi']$. By the fourth Kan condition of $A\psi$ type $[\Psi', x]$, $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle)) \in A\psi\langle r'/x\rangle$ $[\Psi']$. The result follows by the introduction rule and $\mathsf{lso}_{r'}(I\psi\langle r'/x\rangle)$ $[\Psi']$.

The final case is $r''\psi = w \neq x$: if $M \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)$ $[\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi)}(M) \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r'/x\rangle)$ $[\Psi']$. We appeal to Lemma 51 with

$$\{X^{\Psi''}_{\psi'}\}_{\psi':\Psi''\to\Psi'} = \begin{cases} \mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(M\psi') & \text{if } w\psi' = 0 \\ \mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{x.B\psi\psi'}(M\psi') & \text{if } w\psi' = 1 \\ \mathsf{iain}_{w'}(C, F\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle) & \text{if } w\psi' = w' \end{cases}$$

$$C = \mathsf{com}^{w'}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(r\psi' \rightsquigarrow r'\psi', D; y.\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow y}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(M\psi'), y.\mathsf{app}(G\psi\psi'\langle y/x\rangle, \mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow y}_{x.B\psi\psi'}(M\psi')))$$
$$D = \mathsf{iaout}_{w'}(M\psi', G\psi\psi'\langle r\psi'/x\rangle)$$

We begin by showing the following result, which states the well-formedness of the com in $X^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}}$.

Lemma 57. *If* $\mathsf{Iso}_w(I\psi)\ [\Psi', x]$ *and* $M \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$ *where* $w \neq x$*, then*

1. $\mathsf{iaout}_w(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$,
2. $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow y}_{x.A\psi}(M) \in A\psi\langle y/x\rangle\ [\Psi', y \mid w = 0]$,
3. $\mathsf{app}(G\psi\langle y/x\rangle, \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow y}_{x.B\psi}(M)) \in A\psi\langle y/x\rangle\ [\Psi', y \mid w = 1]$,
4. $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.A\psi}(M) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_w(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi' \mid w = 0]$*, and*
5. $\mathsf{app}(G\psi\langle r/x\rangle, \mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.B\psi}(M)) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_w(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi' \mid w = 1]$.

Proof.

1. Follows by the elimination rule.
2. Let $\psi' : \Psi'' \to (\Psi', y)$ satisfy $w = 0$; we must show $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow y\psi'}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(M\psi') \in A\psi\langle y/x\rangle\psi'\ [\Psi'']$. We know that $M \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$, so $M\psi' \in \mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi\psi'\langle r\psi'/x\rangle)\ [\Psi'']$ and thus $M\psi' \in A\psi\psi'\langle r\psi'/x\rangle\ [\Psi'']$. The result follows from the fourth Kan condition of $A\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'', x]$.
3. Let $\psi' : \Psi'' \to (\Psi', y)$ satisfy $w = 1$; we must show $\mathsf{app}(G\psi\langle y/x\rangle\psi', \mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow y\psi'}_{x.B\psi\psi'}(M\psi')) \in A\psi\langle y/x\rangle\psi'\ [\Psi'']$. We know $M\psi' \in \mathsf{ia}_1(I\psi\psi'\langle r\psi'/x\rangle)\ [\Psi'']$, so $M\psi' \in B\psi\psi'\langle r\psi'/x\rangle\ [\Psi'']$. We know $B\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi', x \mid w = 1]$, so $B\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'', x]$, and by its fourth Kan condition, $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow y\psi'}_{x.B\psi\psi'}(M\psi') \in B\psi\langle y/x\rangle\psi'\ [\Psi'']$. We know $G\psi \in B\psi \to A\psi\ [\Psi', x \mid w = 1]$, so $G\psi\langle y/x\rangle\psi' \in B\psi\langle y/x\rangle\psi' \to A\psi\langle y/x\rangle\psi'\ [\Psi'']$, and the result follows by the elimination rule for dependent functions.
4. Under a satisfying ψ', show $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(M\psi') \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_0(M\psi', G\psi\langle r/x\rangle\psi') \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\psi'\ [\Psi'']$. By the fifth Kan condition of $A\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'', x]$, the left-hand side is $- \doteq M\psi' \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\psi'\ [\Psi'']$; by the elimination rule, so is the right-hand side.
5. Under a satisfying ψ', show

   $$\mathsf{app}(G\psi\langle r/x\rangle\psi', \mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r\psi'}_{x.B\psi\psi'}(M\psi')) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_1(M\psi', G\psi\langle r/x\rangle\psi') \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\psi'\ [\Psi''].$$

   By the elimination rule for dependent functions and the fifth Kan condition of $B\psi\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'', x]$, the left-hand side is $- \doteq \mathsf{app}(G\psi\langle r/x\rangle\psi', M\psi') \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\psi'\ [\Psi'']$; by the elimination rule, so is the right-hand side. □

Now, for each $\psi' : \Psi'' \to \Psi'$, we show that $X^{\Psi''}_{\psi'} \doteq (X^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}})\psi' \in \mathsf{ia}_{w\psi'}(I\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle)\ [\Psi'']$, from which it follows that $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r'}_{x.\mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi)}(M) \doteq X^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}} \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r'/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$. This completes the proof of the fourth Kan condition (including the binary case, by transitivity).

1. $w\psi' = 0$.

   By the introduction rule, Lemma 57, and Theorem 35, $(X^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}})\psi' \doteq \mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{x.A\psi\psi'}(M\psi') \in A\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle\ [\Psi'']$. The result follows by $A\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle \doteq \mathsf{ia}_0(I\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle)\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi'']$.

2. $w\psi' = 1$.

   By the introduction rule, Lemma 57, and Theorem 35,

   $$(X^{\Psi'}_{\mathsf{id}_{\Psi'}})\psi' \doteq \mathsf{app}(F\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle, \mathsf{app}(G\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle, \mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{x.B\psi\psi'}(M\psi'))) \in B\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle\ [\Psi''].$$

   By $\mathsf{Iso}_w(I\psi)\ [\Psi', x]$, we have $\mathsf{Iso}_1(I\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\psi')\ [\Psi'']$, so $B\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'', x]$ and

   $$b : B\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\psi' \gg \mathsf{app}(F\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\psi', \mathsf{app}(G\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\psi', b)) \doteq b \in B\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\psi'\ [\Psi''].$$

   By $M \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$ and the fourth Kan condition of $B\psi\langle r'/x\rangle\psi'\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi'', x]$, we have $\mathsf{coe}^{r\psi'\rightsquigarrow r'\psi'}_{x.B\psi\psi'}(M\psi') \in B\psi\psi'\langle r'\psi'/x\rangle\ [\Psi'']$. The result follows by instantiating the open equation.

3. $w\psi' = w'$.

   Immediate by the introduction rule, Lemma 57, and Theorem 35.

The fifth Kan condition requires that for any $\psi : (\Psi', x) \to \Psi$, if $M \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi\langle r/x\rangle}(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.\mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi}(I\psi)}(M) \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_{r''\psi\langle r/x\rangle}(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$.

There are three cases. If $r''\psi = \varepsilon$ then this follows from the fact that $\mathsf{ia}_\varepsilon(I\psi)\ \mathsf{pretype}\ [\Psi']$ and $A\psi$ or $B\psi$ (depending on ε) are equally Kan. If $r''\psi = x$ then we know $M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$ and must show $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.\mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi)}(M) \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$. By Lemma 24 it suffices to show

$$\mathsf{iain}_r(\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle)), F\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi'].$$

In this case we know $\mathsf{Iso}_x(I\psi)\ [\Psi', x]$, so $\mathsf{Iso}_r(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$, and by the elimination rule and $M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$, we have $\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$. By the fifth Kan condition of $A\psi\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi', x]$, $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.A\psi}(\mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle)) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_r(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \in A\psi\langle r/x\rangle\ [\Psi']$. The result follows from the introduction and eta rules.

The final case is $r''\psi = w \neq x$: if $M \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$, then $\mathsf{coe}^{r\rightsquigarrow r}_{x.\mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi)}(M) \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$. We have already shown that the left-hand side

$$- \doteq \mathsf{iain}_w(\mathsf{com}^w_{x.A\psi}(r \rightsquigarrow r, \mathsf{iaout}_w(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle); y.\ldots, y.\ldots), F\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi'].$$

By the introduction rule, Lemma 57, and Theorem 35, this in turn

$$- \doteq \mathsf{iain}_w(\mathsf{iaout}_w(M, G\psi\langle r/x\rangle), F\psi\langle r/x\rangle) \in \mathsf{ia}_w(I\psi\langle r/x\rangle)\ [\Psi']$$

and the result follows by the eta rule.

Fixed point construction We obtain a cubical type system with all isomorphism-univalence types (in addition to the previous connectives) by extending the construction in Appendix A.2. Define an operator on cubical type systems $F(E, \Phi) = (E', \Phi')$ as before with the additional clauses:

$$
\begin{aligned}
E' = \ldots \\
\quad \cup \{((\Psi, x), \mathsf{ia}_x(A, B, F, G), \mathsf{ia}_x(A', B', F', G')) \mid \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models \big(A \doteq A' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x]\big) \wedge (E, \Phi) \models \big(B \doteq B' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 1]\big) \wedge \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models \big(A \to B \doteq A' \to B' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 1]\big) \wedge \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models \big(B \to A \doteq B' \to A' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 1]\big) \wedge \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models \big(F \doteq F' \in A \to B\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 1]\big) \wedge \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models \big(G \doteq G' \in B \to A\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 1]\big) \wedge \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models (a : A \gg \mathsf{app}(G, \mathsf{app}(F, a)) \doteq a \in A\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 1]) \wedge \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models (b : B \gg \mathsf{app}(F, \mathsf{app}(G, b)) \doteq b \in B\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 1])\} \\
\Phi' = \ldots \\
\quad \cup \{((\Psi, x), \mathsf{ia}_x(A, B, F, G), \mathsf{iain}_x(M, F'), \mathsf{iain}_x(M', F'')) \mid \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models \big(M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi, x]\big) \wedge \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models \big(F \doteq F' \in A \to B\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 1]\big) \wedge \\
\qquad (E, \Phi) \models \big(F \doteq F'' \in A \to B\ [\Psi, x \mid x = 1]\big)\}
\end{aligned}
$$

The resulting F is monotone, so it has a least fixed point. Let (E, Φ) be a fixed point of F; by our previous argument, (E, Φ) has all dependent function types. To see that (E, Φ) has all isomorphism-univalence types, suppose that $(E, \Phi) \models (\mathsf{Iso}_r(I) \doteq \mathsf{Iso}_r(I')\ [\Psi])$. Then for any $\psi : (\Psi', x) \to \Psi$ where $r\psi = x$, $(E, \Phi) \models (\mathsf{Iso}_x(I\psi) \doteq \mathsf{Iso}_x(I'\psi)\ [\Psi', x])$. By the definition of F, $E((\Psi', x), \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi), \mathsf{ia}_x(I'\psi))$ and $\Phi((\Psi', x), \mathsf{ia}_x(I\psi), -, -)$ is the least relation relating $\mathsf{iain}_x(M, F')$ and $\mathsf{iain}_x(M', F'')$ when:

$$
\begin{gathered}
(E, \Phi) \models \big(M \doteq M' \in A\psi\ [\Psi', x]\big) \\
(E, \Phi) \models \big(F\psi \doteq F' \in A\psi \to B\psi\ [\Psi', x \mid x = 1]\big) \\
(E, \Phi) \models \big(F\psi \doteq F'' \in A\psi \to B\psi\ [\Psi', x \mid x = 1]\big)
\end{gathered}
$$

Proof theory The above construction justifies adding the following rules to our proof theory:

$$
\mathsf{Iso}_r(A, B, F, G)\ [\Psi] := \begin{cases}
A \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \\
B \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi \mid r = 1] \\
F \in A \to B\ [\Psi \mid r = 1] \\
G \in B \to A\ [\Psi \mid r = 1] \\
a : A \gg \mathsf{app}(G, \mathsf{app}(F, a)) \doteq a \in A\ [\Psi \mid r = 1] \\
b : B \gg \mathsf{app}(F, \mathsf{app}(G, b)) \doteq b \in B\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\frac{\begin{array}{l}
A \doteq A' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi] \\
B \doteq B' \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi \mid r = 1] \\
F \doteq F' \in A \to B\ [\Psi \mid r = 1] \\
G \doteq G' \in B \to A\ [\Psi \mid r = 1] \\
a : A \gg \mathsf{app}(G, \mathsf{app}(F, a)) \doteq a \in A\ [\Psi \mid r = 1] \\
b : B \gg \mathsf{app}(F, \mathsf{app}(G, b)) \doteq b \in B\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]
\end{array}}{\mathsf{ia}_r(A, B, F, G) \doteq \mathsf{ia}_r(A', B', F', G') \ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}
$$

$$\frac{A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{ia}_0(A,B,F,G) \doteq A\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{B\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{ia}_1(A,B,F,G) \doteq B\ \mathsf{type}\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \doteq M' \in A\ [\Psi] \quad \mathsf{Iso}_r(A,B,F,G)\ [\Psi] \quad F \doteq F' \in A \to B\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]}{\mathsf{iain}_r(M,F) \doteq \mathsf{iain}_r(M',F') \in \mathsf{ia}_r(A,B,F,G)\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \in A\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{iain}_0(M,F) \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{M \in A\ [\Psi] \quad F \in A \to B\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{iain}_1(M,F) \doteq \mathsf{app}(F,M) \in B\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \doteq M' \in \mathsf{ia}_r(A,B,F,G)\ [\Psi] \quad \mathsf{Iso}_r(A,B,F,G)\ [\Psi] \quad G \doteq G' \in B \to A\ [\Psi \mid r = 1]}{\mathsf{iaout}_r(M,G) \doteq \mathsf{iaout}_r(M',G') \in A\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \in A\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{iaout}_0(M,G) \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{M \in B\ [\Psi] \quad G \in B \to A\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{iaout}_1(M,G) \doteq \mathsf{app}(G,M) \in A\ [\Psi]}$$

$$\frac{M \in A\ [\Psi] \quad \mathsf{Iso}_r(A,B,F,G)\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{iaout}_r(\mathsf{iain}_r(M,F),G) \doteq M \in A\ [\Psi]} \qquad \frac{M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(A,B,F,G)\ [\Psi] \quad \mathsf{Iso}_r(A,B,F,G)\ [\Psi]}{\mathsf{iain}_r(\mathsf{iaout}_r(M,G),F) \doteq M \in \mathsf{ia}_r(A,B,F,G)\ [\Psi]}$$

References

Stuart F. Allen. A Non-type-theoretic Definition of Martin-Löf's Types. In D. Gries, editor, *Proceedings of the 2nd IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 215–224. IEEE Computer Society Press, June 1987.

Carlo Angiuli, Robert Harper, and Todd Wilson. Computational higher type theory I: Abstract cubical realizability. Preprint, April 2016. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.08873`.

Marc Bezem, Thierry Coquand, and Simon Huber. A model of type theory in cubical sets. In *19th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2013)*, volume 26, pages 107–128, 2014.

Cyril Cohen, Thierry Coquand, Simon Huber, and Anders Mörtberg. Cubical type theory: a constructive interpretation of the univalence axiom. (To appear), January 2016.

Robert L. Constable, et al. *Implementing Mathematics with the Nuprl Proof Development Environment*. Prentice-Hall, 1985.

B. A. Davey and H. A. Priestley. *Introduction to lattices and order*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2002. ISBN 0-521-78451-4. URL `http://opac.inria.fr/record=b1077513`.

Robert Harper. Constructing type systems over an operational semantics. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 14(1):71–84, July 1992. ISSN 0747-7171. doi: 10.1016/0747-7171(92)90026-Z. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0747-7171(92)90026-Z`.

Daniel R. Licata and Guillaume Brunerie. A cubical type theory, November 2014. URL `http://dlicata.web.wesleyan.edu/pubs/lb14cubical/lb14cubes-oxford.pdf`. Talk at Oxford Homotopy Type Theory Workshop.

Daniel R. Licata and Robert Harper. Canonicity for 2-dimensional type theory. In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, POPL '12, pages 337–348, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-1083-3. doi: 10.1145/2103656.2103697. URL `http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2103656.2103697`.

P. Martin-Löf. Constructive mathematics and computer programming. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series A*, 312:501–518, October 1984. doi: 10.1098/rsta.1984.0073.

Per Martin-Löf. Intuitionistic type theory. *Naples: Bibliopolis*, 1984.

A. M. Pitts. Nominal Presentation of Cubical Sets Models of Type Theory. In H. Herbelin, P. Letouzey, and M. Sozeau, editors, *20th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2014)*, volume 39 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 202–220, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2015. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. ISBN 978-3-939897-88-0. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.TYPES.2014.202. URL `http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2015/5498`.